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ABSTRACT

Polite linguistic behaviour is concerned with how society and individuals interact. Speakers modify their linguistic choices based on a sociocultural context. Most research on politeness examines social variables such as power and distance (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1987), but rarely the individuals themselves. This study looks both at how social factors and facts about individuals such as self-esteem affect request dialogues in Persian.

In this mixed methods study, 36 Iranian men participated in open role plays to collect controlled yet quasi-normal speech across scenarios differing by power and distance. The self-esteem of each participant was collected using the Rosenberg (1965) self-esteem questionnaire. Request speech acts and supportive moves were coded and quantitatively compared to test the impact of power, distance, and self-esteem. Additionally, stimulated recall interviews were conducted to gather the thoughts of the participants about their choices in each prompt. Interviews were analysed through inductive content analysis to identify themes and develop theory. Finally, the role play request dialogues were treated as whole conversations (Clark, 1996), rather than singular speech acts. In this approach, request conversations are joint interactional activities that the speakers wish to accomplish, allowing the study of both the key elements of that joint task and the manner in which request conversations develop.

In alignment with Brown and Levinson’s predictions, Persian speakers used more words and more turns when their addressee was of a higher power status, and also when the addressee was an intimate. Moreover, participants identified power and distance as important to their decisions, and power shaped the request conversation. There were also variations in conversation style and thought processes for speakers of low versus high self-esteem.

The triangulated method of studying requests additionally revealed critical concepts for behaviour beyond power and distance, conversational motivations for linguistic politeness choices, and the need for additional categories for coding Persian requests. Finally, speech act quantification and interviews revealed that speakers do make strategic politeness choices. However, control of those choices is frequently divided between speakers such that the request does not arrive fully formed from the requester. Rather, it is co-constructed during the conversation, and what look from the outside like strategic choices of the requester are actually interactional consequences of choices from the addressee.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Making requests has always been an important part of people’s communication. The request is among the most common speech acts used in everyday conversations (e.g., Fraser, 1978; Gilabert & Barón, 2013). Perhaps due to their frequency in conversation, requests are the speech acts which have received the most attention in research (e.g., Hendriks, 2008; Kasper, 1997). Requests have been analysed by researchers both in perception and in production, both from a monolingual and interlanguage pragmatics perspectives. Fraser (1978) explained why requests need to be studied effectively:

“Requests are very frequent in language use (far more frequent, for example, than apologizing or promising); requests are very important to the second language learner; they have been researched in more detail than any other type of speech act; they permit a wide variety of strategies for their performance; and, finally, they carry with them a wide range of subtle implications involving politeness, deference, and mitigation” (p. 6).

Appropriateness of speech acts such as the request reflects fundamental cultural values and social norms of a language and demonstrates the rules and structures of language use in a community. Appropriate request behaviour is essential for effective interaction, which helps in establishing and maintaining relationships. Culture plays a crucial role in determining the appropriateness of a speech act in social interactions (Spencer-Oatey, 2000, 2002). A speaker modifies his linguistic choices based on how the speaker and his utterances are situated within a sociocultural context. Linguistic interaction, as Miller (1974) discusses, cannot truly happen

---

2 This thesis did not attempt to use a specific theoretical notion of context. For the cultural context, the study limited context by using very specific participants and situations. It indicates contextual features such as the types of tasks, participants, their roles, their relationships, etc. For the conversational context, whole request conversations were considered.
If interlocutors fail to comprehend each other’s intention. Therefore, tactful requests are crucial to approach and then achieve interational and strategic goals.

There are numerous studies of requests in different languages. Many studies are of requests by English language learners (Béal, 1990; Bilbow, 1995; House, 1989; House & Kasper, 1987; Rintell, 1981; Scarcella & Brunak, 1981; Trosborg, 1995; Zimin, 1981). Requests of other Western languages being acquired by second language learners have also been studied—for example, Spanish (Koike, 1989; Le Pair, 1996), German (Færch & Kasper, 1989), and French (Harlow, 1990), as well as Hebrew (Blum-Kulka, 1982, 1983, 1991; Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Weizman, 1993). In Iranian contexts, there are a few studies on requests; for example, Eslamirasekh (1993) and Jalilifar (2009) have focused on cross-cultural similarities and differences between Persian and English; there have, however, been few attempts to examine request behaviour at the level of discourse and interaction in Persian itself, nor in a cross-linguistic context. Learning about the whole request interaction is the primary purpose of this study. Such a study would aim at helping understand how Iranians perform the request task jointly, and hence to what extent earlier findings from other previous Persian studies are supported or rejected.

Initiating a request deals with cost and benefit to speakers. Trosborg (1995) defines the request speech act as “an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker” (p. 187). Speakers may change the way that they express a request, such as altering the level of directness of the request, depending on many factors. Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper (1989) indicated three levels of directness for requests. The first level is ‘direct’. In these forms of request, messages are frankly conveyed and explicit performative verbs are used in requestive forms (‘Open the door, please.’). The other level is ‘conventionally indirect’ where requests are made indirectly based on some expected norms (‘Could you possibly open the door?’). The last level, ‘non-conventionally indirect’, includes clues, some indirect explanations that are not formalised in the language (‘It’s too cold here, isn’t it?’), and therefore the addressees must infer that the speaker intends to request (e.g., Hassall, 2003).

Since requests have potential to put pressure on addressees, these acts can threaten their negative face: “freedom of action and freedom from imposition” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 61). Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) propose the head act as the essential unit of the request which is optionally preceded or followed by supportive moves. Supportive moves are to soften or
increase the pressure or the threat on addressees. Many other studies (Márquez Reiter, 2000; Safont-Jordà, 2005, 2008; Sifianou, 1999; Trosborg, 1995) also offered a similar pattern for request speech acts including supportive discourse moves. External modifications are usually longer than internal ones, are affixed to the head act (Aijmer, 1996), and are also less formulaic than internal modifiers (Færch & Kasper, 1989). Checking on availability (e.g., ‘May I come in?’), reasons (e.g., ‘I couldn’t attend some sessions of the class.’), and disarmers (e.g., ‘I’m sorry that I disturbed you.’) are options to use externally (Félix-Brasdefer, 2005). Some languages like Dutch prefer to use internal modification like politeness markers (e.g., ‘please’), and some like French and Persian prefer external modifications (see Saberi, 2012; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011; Van Mulken, 1996). For example, Salmani Nodoushan and Allami (2011) showed that external supportive moves were used twice as often as internal ones. However, while the categories outlined for request speech acts have clearly been informative, they likely present an incomplete picture of how requests function. There might be some moves which are not included in the common modification categories, although they help the dialogue move forward. Therefore, the present study conducts multiple analyses in analysing speech acts to identify such gaps (see section 2.3.1.4).

Negotiating a request (see section 5.3.5) is inevitably involved with politeness. Polite linguistic behaviour is principally concerned with how society and an individual interact. Requests are closely related to politeness because achieving a person’s want of face seems important and the speaker wants to leave a positive evaluation of himself in others (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Since the earliest studies of politeness (Arndt & Janney, 1985, 1991; Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987; Lakoff, 1972, 1973, 1979; Leech, 1980, 1983), different approaches and models on pragmatics have emerged that have viewed and analysed politeness differently. The Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) politeness model holds that politeness is determined mainly by three social factors: power, distance and rank of imposition. The validity of these factors has been investigated in a number of contexts including interlanguage ones (e.g., Abdolrezaapour & Eslami-Rasekh, 2012; Diaz Perez, 1999; Félix-Brasdefer, 2006; Márquez Reiter, 2000, 2002; Schauer, 2009; Scollon & Scollon, 2001). Such research looks at politeness as a pragmatic strategy to save face, or so-called second-order politeness which is based on the research analyst’s view to evaluate politeness. However, some scholars have adopted an emic cultural understanding of politeness (e.g., Eelen, 2001; Grainger, Kerkam, Mansor & Mills, 2015; Haugh, 2012; Kasper, 2006; Locher, 2004, 2008; Spencer-Oatey, 2000, 2005;

Since recent studies have shifted their attention from traditional approaches to conversation analysis, an extensive literature on pragmatics (e.g., Golato, 2005; Heritage, 2005, 2009; Holmes, 2006; Holmes & Stubbe, 2015; Izadi, 2015, 2016, 2017; Kasper, 2004; Schegloff, 1980, 2007; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006) has investigated both speakers’ understanding of a conversation and how politeness is perceived and responded to in interaction sequences. These studies include how speakers perform speech acts and also how speakers interpret and use utterances depending on what an addressee meant. This perspective tries not to go beyond the actual dialogue between participants to see what prompted them to talk or act differently. However, van der Bom and Mills (2015) attempted to change pragmatic scholars’ view towards a discursive approach to politeness. They analyse talk in interaction in terms of focusing on the participants’ judgements as well as the researchers’ interpretation of the participants’ evaluations.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The current study takes the request as part of a full conversation, which analyses the coordination of both speakers jointly. Clark (1996, p. 25) discusses that both perspectives, “a cognitive and a social science” of each individual’s performance as well as of their action created as a pair, must be focused on in a joint activity. It can give us a better understanding of how speakers negotiate the request topic. Joint activities are tasks with certain goals that the speakers accomplish together. Indeed, looking at requests not as a single turn, but as a joint task, identifies the process of how people discuss and evaluate polite behaviour by means of request-responses, extra questions or any further negotiation around the topic. This study will take three different perspectives on requests, believing that each has something to offer: (1) requests as speech acts with a head act, (2) requests as conversations in the sense of Clark (1996), and (3) requests as understood by participants in interviews. As a Persian native speaker, she looks at the research topic from both researcher and local perspectives.

The researcher was also intrigued about whether facts about individuals, in this case self-esteem, could help us understand request dialogues. Most research (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987; Scollon & Scollon, 2001) that has studied politeness explicitly looked at general
social variables, such as social distance and power between interlocutors, while individual psychological differences, such as self-esteem, are under-researched. A concern with how people value themselves is hardly new, as references to what is called self-esteem can be found in the work of the ancient philosophers. Given the face–threatening nature of requests (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987), appropriate requests are socially needed to reach interactional and strategic goals. Coopersmith (1967) stated that when people achieve their favourable goals, they can assess themselves as prosperous and worthy individuals. In psychology, self-esteem (see Rosenberg, 1965; Coopersmith, 1967; James, [1890] 1983) is about how we think and feel about ourselves on a long-term basis, while requests reflect in part the worth that a person feels and what they socially warrant. Therefore, self-esteem contributes to the creation of the situation. Importantly, self-esteem is not the same as self-confidence. Self-confidence is about how we feel about our abilities and it can vary from time to time while self-esteem is a rather stable feature of an adult’s personality across time. The way people judge their politeness and their interlocutor’s politeness may relate to their self-esteem as it deals with self-worthiness and evaluation about behaviour. This study, therefore, combines broad social differences, power and distance, with individual psychological differences, particularly self-esteem, to look at Persian requests. It contributes to a substantial body of research that has accumulated over more than four decades, seeking to discover if facts about individuals could help us understand request dialogues and politeness more generally.

This study uses a mixed-methods approach, using open role plays between pairs, stimulated recall interviews, and a self-esteem questionnaire (Rosenberg, 1965) to examine whether social and individual factors influence Persian request behaviour. All role play conversations are audio- and video-recorded. Each pair, either speaker or addressee, is interviewed about their thoughts on their own choices for each role play prompt through watching their recorded video.

In sum, this study asks whether power, social distance, and self-esteem affect request behaviour in Persian. This question will be asked from a variety of perspectives, including a speech act approach, an interactional approach, and an interview-based approach. Chapter 2 sets up the full research questions through reviewing recent research into different politeness approaches, Persian requests and self-esteem. Chapter 3 discusses the options for studying request behaviour and justifies open role play as most appropriate for the study’s research questions. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 provide analyses of requests as speech acts, conversations, and
interview-based interpretation, respectively. A general discussion and conclusions follow in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The current chapter argues that Persian requests cannot be understood without understanding social power, social distance, and self-esteem. Self-esteem might influence particular request choices in Persian contexts. To reach this conclusion, the following four topics will be discussed: (1) requests, (2) politeness theory, (3) emic perceptions of Persian politeness (adab) and (4) self-esteem. The first section gives an account of the definition, function, general structure and classification of request speech acts. The second section deals with the definition of politeness and different approaches to politeness. The next one looks at how first order politeness works in Iranian society and also reviews recent research into Persian requests. The last section examines whether individual factors, in this case self-esteem, influence request interaction.

2.2 REQUEST

People use different speech acts (e.g., requests) in their conversations every day. Speech acts can be defined as “the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication” (Searle, 1969, p. 16). For Hendriks (2008) and Kasper (1997) requests are the speech acts which have received the most attention. Making appropriate and tactful requests in different contexts is important in every culture, but linguistic interaction, as Miller (1974) discusses, cannot truly happen if interlocutors fail to comprehend each other’s intention. However, competent language speakers usually realise the illocutionary meaning of utterances. They are aided by recognizable features and common strategies that help them communicate successfully and meet their needs.

Any genuine request follows some definite rules (Searle, 1969). First, it should include at least two interlocutors: a speaker and a hearer. Then, the speaker asks the hearer to do an action with the following assumptions: the speaker assumes the hearer is in the position to do the action; the speaker assumes the hearer is wishing to do the action; the speaker assumes the hearer will not do the action if not requested. A request also consists of the propositional meaning of the action. The basis of requests’ illocutionary act is “to try to get the hearer to do
something (and not necessarily to commit or obligate him to do it)” (Searle, 1976, p.12). The request is successful once the speaker receives a positive or an appropriate answer from the hearer. It should be noted that Searle’s conception of the speech act shows a request as a single token of speech not a joint accomplishment.

Moreover, Trosborg (1995) indicates that a requestive act benefits speakers, while hearers bear the cost. When people make requests, the request may range “from ordering to begging” (p. 189). In other words, despite the common features that Searle (1976) identified, there are many choices involved in making requests, and not all of them may be perceived in the same way, especially by the hearer. The term ‘strategy’ refers to “the particular choice of sentential form and meaning which the speaker employs in order to perform the intended act” (Fraser, 1978, p. 12). Fraser compared request strategies in fourteen different languages and concluded that the basic strategies that exist in each language are the same. Despite requests and strategies being common, second/foreign language learners transfer their mother tongue into the target language request structure, and this means that they may have different assumptions about the implications of their requests than their interlocutors.

The implications surrounding politeness are particularly important to request strategies. For example, in English, it is typically more polite to use hearer-based strategies (e.g., Can you lend me your class note?) than speaker-based strategies (e.g., I want to borrow your class notes.) (Trosborg, 1995), while, in Persian, people often use the speaker-based strategies using the first person pronoun man ‘I’ rather than second person pronoun to ‘you’ (singular) or shoma ‘you’ (plural) (e.g., [man] mitoonam jozvehatono gharz begiram? ‘Can I borrow your class notes?’) which is viewed as more polite in order not to question their addressees’ freedom or threaten their interlocutors’ face. In other words, Iranians may use a kind of request strategy that, while grammatically correct in English, may receive a different politeness interpretation by an American than by a Persian.

This difference shows the importance of studies on requests in Persian using multiple methodologies. Indeed, looking at Persian requests not as a single turn, but as a joint task, might identify the process of how people discuss and perceive polite behaviour including request-response pairs, multiple requests or any further negotiation (see section 2.3.1.4). It is therefore an open question whether requests are best interpreted as a single turn, what I will call a classic speech act analysis, or as a conversation, what I will call an interactional.

Choosing a name for this sort of analysis is difficult due to the robust history of the field. One possibility would be ‘discursive’ analysis, as this looks at the request discourse. However, that term has already been used for a
analysis. In the following section, I will look at the structure of a request speech act in the
tradition of Searle.

2.2.1 Request Definition
Speech acts fall under five categories based on Searle’s (1976) classification inspired from
Austin (1962) and others: directives (e.g., commands, requests), commissives (e.g., promises,
threats), representatives (e.g., assertions, claims), declaratives (e.g., declaring war), and
expressives (e.g., apologies, thanks). A request is ‘pre-event’ as the wanted act is to be fulfilled
after the utterance is made, as opposed to complaints or thanking, known as ‘post-event’. It is
‘directive’ because it conveys the speaker’s verbal or nonverbal demand to the hearer
illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he/she wants
the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker.” In line with Haverkate
(1984) and Trosborg (1995), the request, originating from a speaker’s need, is an impositive
speech act as well as a face-threatening act. A further definition is given by Félix-Brasdefer
(2005) who describes a request as “a directive act and a pre-event which initiates the
negotiation of face during a conversational interaction” (p. 66). According to these definitions,
in this study, request behaviour refers to the directive and pre-event act that one uses verbally
to ask his need of an addressee and to negotiate for it, which may be face threatening to both
interlocutors.

2.2.2 Request Structure and Classification
To examine the structure of speech acts, requests have mostly traditionally been analysed as
consisting of core head acts and supportive moves. Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) introduce head
act as the essential unit of the request that is optionally preceded or followed by supportive
moves. Supportive moves are peripheral elements that occur pre- or post-posed to the head act.
They do not change the meaning of the request head acts, but they are to soften or increase the
pressure or the threat on addressees. Márquez Reiter (2000), Safont-Jordà (2005, 2008),
Sifianou (1999), and Trosborg (1995) also offered a similar pattern for request speech acts
including supportive discourse moves, in which a request act consists of a main part called the different technique (see section 2.3.1.4). Similarly, we might choose ‘conversational’ analysis as it looks at conversations. Again, though, conversation analysis is already a specific approach. Therefore, I have settled on ‘interactional’ analysis or requests as conversations.
‘head act’, and one or more optional peripheral elements joining the core head act. A head act plays the primary role in a request utterance. It is able to express the requester’s intention solely; however, the subsidiary element may come before or after the head act to soften or intensify the force of a request act. In Faerch and Kasper’s (1989) terms, supportive moves could be either external or internal. Internal supportive moves (e.g., politeness marker ‘please’) are found inside request head acts, while external supportive moves (e.g., reasons) come before or after a request head act with no changes in the propositional meaning. In this study, for the speech act analysis (Chapter 4), the notion of request will be used in its broadest sense to refer to request utterances along with supportive moves, because in terms of different politeness norms, some languages prefer internal modification like Dutch, and some prefer external modification like French and Persian (see Saberi, 2012; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011; Van Mulken, 1996). However, in request dialogues, there might be some moves which are not included in the common modification categories, although they help the talk move forward. Therefore, the analysis of requests as conversations (Chapter 5) focuses on all turns as small parts of a chain to identify request behaviour.

The classification of request head acts is described based on either directness or indirectness level. There are three main strategies for making requests: explicit impositions, conventionalised routines, and indirect hints. Blum-Kulka, Danet and Gherson (1985), and Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) stated that explicit impositives are the most direct strategies that have well-formed request sentences like imperatives. The second form of requests is to use conventionally indirect requests, such as Yes and No questions or questions with modals (‘Would you lend me your car?’ or ‘Could you possibly give me the key?’). Additionally, there are non-conventionally indirect requests, such as mild hints or strong hints. For example, when a speaker says: ‘it’s too cold, isn’t it?’, s/he wants the listener to close the window if the listener is in the position of fulfilling the request.

Apart from the above general classification, Trosborg (1995) proposed a modified request classification based upon her study’s results in terms of directness, which had previously been developed by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), and House and Kasper (1981). The most comprehensive set of these classifications is from Trosborg (1995), which is what I will use to analyse Persian requests quantitatively (Chapter 4; sections 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2 & 4.2.1.3). For example, her schema includes obligation (‘You must/have to lend me your car.’) and elliptical phrases (‘Your car (please.’) for direct request strategies.
Permission (‘May I borrow your car?’) and willingness (‘Would you lend me your car?’) are used for the conventional indirect requests (Trosborg, 1995, pp. 209-15).

There are also studies on requests that have been carried out in terms of internal and external supportive discourse moves (Færch & Kasper, 1989; House & Kasper, 1981; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011). Lexical and syntactic are two types of internal modifications by which a speaker can modify the threat of a request (Færch & Kasper, 1989; House & Kasper, 1981). If they mitigate the impact of a request, they are called ‘downgraders’ like conditional clauses (‘I would like to borrow some of your records if you don’t mind lending me them.’). Otherwise, they are ‘upgraders’ that increase the force of a request like adverbial intensifier (‘You really must come and see me.’) (Trosborg, 1995, pp. 209-15).

External supportive moves come before or after the request head act to make it reasonable and receivable for the addressee like promise of a reward (‘If you do the dishes I’ll give you my movie ticket.’) and disarmers (‘I hope I’m not disturbing you but...’) (Trosborg, 1995, pp. 209-15). They are usually longer than internal ones and are just affixed to the head act (Aijmer, 1996). They are also less formulaic than internal modifiers (Færch & Kasper, 1989).

In Persian, using a number of different external supportive moves either before or after the request head act is common in a single requestive interaction (Saberi, 2012; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011), so Trosborg’s request schema, particularly the external categories, fits Persian well. However, some Persian studies used different request classifications for their data coding, such as Salmani Nodoushan (2008) using Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) classification, and Modarresi Tehrani and Tajali (1391/2012) using Alcón-Soler, Martínez-Flor and Safont-Jordà’s (2005) request classification for their data. The difference in those request classifications to Trosborg’s (1995) request schema is that they mainly deal with classifications and groupings of internal modifications. This study uses Trosborg, and the detailed external supportive moves (pp. 216-18) are shown in Chapter 4 (see section 4.2.1.3).

Three types of research have shown that strategy choices differ across cultures: single language studies (e.g., Félix-Brasdefer, 2005 on Mexican Spanish; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006 on German; Walters, 1979 on Puerto Rican Spanish; Wierzbicka, 2003 on Polish, among others), cross-cultural studies, and interlanguage studies. In a single language study of English,
Trosborg (1995) maintained that direct strategies such as imperatives (e.g., ‘close the door’) or requests with performative verbs (e.g., ‘I ask you to close the door’) are not frequently used as request strategies. Hong (1999) claims that in English culture, imperatives which appear as commands/orders are not considered to be polite requests except in some hierarchical positions like an officer-soldier relationship, where the speaker’s power status is higher than the listener. Instead, conventionally indirect requests (e.g., ‘Could you possibly speak loudly?’) are preferred as the speaker lets the addressee have some freedom of choice (Aijmer, 1996).

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) maintained there is a correlation between social factors, politeness and the application of indirectness. If there is a high amount of indirectness, it leads to more politeness.

However, some languages and cultures may make requests through direct strategies with no impolite implication. In Chinese, direct requests particularly with friends and next of kin make sense in daily-life contacts (Hong, 1999). For example, in Chinese requests, qǐng ‘please’ is usually used with strangers and is not common to use with acquaintances or in familial relations because it is seen as a distant politeness marker and treats them like strangers (Lee-Wong, 1994). Similarly, Iranians do not often plainly use lotfan or khaøeshan ‘please’ in their requests with friends; they, however, use more friendly politeness markers like ghorban-e dastet expressing thanks in advance, bizahmat literally meaning ‘no trouble’ in direct requests, or using informal verbs like mishe? ‘[would it be] possible?’ in conventional requests which avoid distance (Saberi, 2012). The differences that are apparent in single language studies have led to cross-cultural studies that compare two or more varieties.

A large number of interlanguage studies have been conducted examining request acts in various languages (Blum-Kulka, 1987 on Hebrew and American English; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989 on German, Hebrew, Australian English, Canadian French and Argentine Spanish; Chen & Chen, 2007 on Taiwanese and English; Eslamirasekh, 1993 on Persian and English; Eslami-Rasekh, Tavakoli & Abdolreza-pour, 2010 on Persian and English; Márquez Reiter, Rainey & Fulcher, 2005 on British and Spanish; and Sifianou, 1992 on Greek and British English, among others). The primary goal of cross-cultural studies is to broaden the comprehension of social norms and beliefs over the successful production of speech acts (Meier, 1995), as well as the understanding of similarities and differences in performing social interactions in different languages (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985). For example, Eslamirasekh (1993) studied the similarities and differences of requests made in Persian and English. The result indicated that Persian university students made more direct requests compared to American native speakers.
in different settings. The Persian examples are such as ‘Were you in class yesterday? Give me your notes to write. Excuse me.’ or ‘Please give me your pen for a moment.’ and the English ones are such as ‘Menu, please.’ and ‘Close the window.’ (p. 102). Márquez Reiter et al. (2005) aimed at understanding the certainty level of a requester on the compliance of addressee in British English and Peninsular Spanish. Their findings have displayed that there is a significant difference between the groups in soliciting conventionally indirect requests. For example, English conventional requests were speaker-oriented and formed using conditional while Spanish conventional requests were hearer-oriented by using less tentative and very few mitigating devices. However, there was a positive correlation between the perception of requesters on the compliance of requests and using conventionally indirect for the request forms in both languages. Similarly, Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2010) analysed request speech acts in Persian compared to English to investigate similarities and differences in choosing conventionally indirect and the degree of certainty of the requesters to comply with the addressees. For example, the Iranian participants made their request such as ‘Is it possible to borrow your pen?’ and the English example is such as ‘Excuse me, could you give me your pen so that I can fill out this form?’. Chen and Chen’s (2007) results showed that the conventionally indirect request was the most frequent choice for both groups of respondents, Taiwanese EFL learners and American speakers, in which both interlocutors have equal social status.

Further, several interlanguage studies have focused on comparing different types of Persian and English speech acts to show cross-cultural differences, such as complaints (Eslamirasekh, 2004), invitations (Salmani Nodoushan, 2006), refusals (Keshavarz, Eslami & Ghahraman, 2006), griping (Allami, 2006), apologies (Afghari, 2007), requests (Eslamirasekh, 1993; Jalilifar, 2009), compliments (Heidari, Rezazadeh & Eslami-Rasekh, 2009; Sharifian, 2008) and reprimands (Ahmadian & Vahid Dastjerdi, 2010). There have, however, been few attempts to examine request behaviour at the level of discourse and to observe the correlation of two variables of social power and distance with individual differences, in this case self-esteem, together during request interactions, as this study does.

Since most research (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1987) shows that politeness is involved in making an appropriate request, in the following section, politeness is first defined and different approaches to politeness and also the impact of social factors on it are then reviewed.
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2.3 POLITENESS THEORY

The term *politeness* can be used both colloquially and as a technical term. For instance, when people make requests, they wish to present a polite image of themselves in the colloquial sense. Additionally, researchers have called the study of how such interactions occur “politeness” research. Requests are often considered as a part of politeness research because verbal or non-verbal asking can threaten individuals’ relationship. An improper request might end up with an unsuccessful result or significantly affect the social relationship. Therefore, it is important to know what politeness or appropriate behaviour is or how it is interpreted in different cultures.

The origin of the term ‘politeness’ dates back to the sixteenth century (see Eelen, 2001; Elias, 1978; Ehlich, 1992) and often relates to civility, courtesy, and good manners. People with different ethnic, cultural and national backgrounds show their politeness through verbal and non-verbal languages, cultures, rituals, deeds and symbols. Although it can be difficult to find a term for politeness in every language, it is possible to express the concept of politeness by talking about related concepts. This also poses a problem for researchers in pragmatics with regard to cross-cultural communication (Haugh, 2012). For example, in Igbo, there is not a precise term for politeness, but the term ‘good behaviour’ is used instead (Watts, 2003). Within sociolinguistics, politeness is defined as “learning to accommodate to others within a given social group” (France, 1992, p. 5).

Every day social interactions generally involve politeness. Politeness can be marked in people’s face-to-face conversations, both verbally and non-verbally. It is encountered as a fundamental part of social interactions and people mostly tend to use polite language by conforming to social norms while they are addressing each other (Gupta, Romano & Walker, 2005). Politeness inevitably deals with linguistic structures and forms (see Eelen, 2001; Watts, 2003) and there can be different interpretations for polite language in different communities of practice. Although competent members of each community are aware of current social norms and conventions and are in the position to differentiate polite behaviour from impolite, availability of politeness sources and interpretations of them can differ (van der Bom & Mills, 2015). Different factors are involved in specifying politeness, such as aspects of social hierarchy and status, as well as the more general notion of proper behavioural conduct (Eelen, 2001). Therefore, “misunderstanding, ambiguity and the potential for interpreting an utterance
as polite or impolite” are main concerns in politeness studies (van der Bom & Mills, 2015, p. 180).

Research into politeness has a long history. Politeness has been defined and studied in the disciplines of pragmatics by Arndt and Janney (1985, 1991); Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987); Eelen (2001); Grainger et al. (2015); Haugh (2012); Lakoff (1972, 1973, 1977); Leech (1980, 1983); Locher (2004, 2008); van der Bom and Mills (2015); Watts (1992, 2003) and many others. Lakoff characterised politeness as “a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange” (1990, p. 34). She views politeness as a means of lessening discrepancy between interlocutors. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) define politeness such that interlocutors’ face is saved by the development of politeness strategies. On Leech’s (1980) view, politeness refers to a strategy or planned means for difficult situations that interlocutors may have in the future in social interactional situations. In Blum-Kulka’s (1992) perspective, a “system of politeness manifests a culturally filtered interpretation of the interaction between four essential parameters: social motivations, expressive modes, social differentials and social meanings” (p. 270). Arndt and Janney (1985) distinguished between ‘social politeness’ and ‘interpersonal politeness or tact’ in their appropriacy-based approach. Social politeness deals with social rules governing a conversation in terms of appropriateness of standard politeness strategies, while interpersonal politeness focuses on saving face for both parties when interacting. Similarly, Scollon and Scollon (2001, pp. 43-46) focus on interpersonal politeness through interlocutors’ face maintenance. The above are variations of what is generally termed second-order politeness (politeness2) which deals with the scientific outsider’s view towards understanding politeness (see Eelen, 2001; Haugh, 2012; Watts, 2003).

Methods for studying politeness and its theoretical underpinnings have changed over 40 years of research. In the following section, these trends are identified and connected to the study of social variables. Finally, the further section will address how the Persian first-order politeness (adab) system works in societal contexts.
2.3.1 Politeness Approaches

2.3.1.1 First wave politeness research

There have been three primary approaches to looking at politeness. First wave politeness research, using van der Bom and Mills’ (2015) classification, is most personified in Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) model which has extensively been discussed, reviewed, and criticised by a number of scholars. Brown and Levinson went beyond the development of Gricean maxims, and their politeness theory was built upon putative universal features of rationality and face. Their account argues that interlocutors’ face is saved by the deployment of politeness strategies.

Despite the fact that Goffman (1955) was the one who introduced the notion of face to the field, it was politeness as discussed by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) that was the starting point for most cultural, intercultural and interlinguistic politeness. Goffman ([1955] 1967) introduced the notion of face, as

“the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self-delineated in terms of approved social attributes” (p. 213).

It implies that an addressee attributes face to a speaker during communication. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) claimed that their conception of face mainly originated from that of Goffman and the English folk notion, as well. Goffman views face as a social perception of self, which is given to people by the society.

2.3.1.2 Second wave politeness research

states that first-order politeness is based on interactants’ folk points of view in an ongoing verbal interaction, while the analyst perspective is a second-order politeness. A first-order approach looks at how participants construe and speak of politeness.

Spencer-Oatey (2000, 2002) argues that culture plays a crucial role in determining appropriateness of a speech act in interaction. Since politeness is evaluated culturally, the specific cultural context will affect judgments of appropriateness. For example, in Persian culture, it is common and looks polite to stand up when an older person (especially with a big age difference to a host), a teacher or a guest enters a room in familiar contexts, while in American culture, it may be fine to remain seated if a guest or someone older than a host enters a place in the same contexts. Take another example,

“while accepting an offer from somebody in the first instance is regarded as appropriate in English (offer ... acceptance), in Iranian culture, one may reject offers once or twice (offer1 ... rejection1 ... offer2 ... rejection2 ... offer3... acceptance)” (Saberi, 2012, p. 33).

In the above examples, the English or Persian speakers define appropriate polite behaviour (verbally or non-verbally) in the context based on their social norms (Saberi, 2012, p. 33).

Mills (2003) argues that “politeness is a matter of judgement and assessment, rather than politeness residing in particular linguistic forms or functions” (p. 110). Politeness is thus considered as a means of negotiation between interlocutors (i.e. speakers and listeners) as different participants may interpret and view the same interaction differently. Native speakers learn their own cultural norms and general principles and are able to produce the appropriate speech act with regards to many factors such as personality, the kind of situation and contextual differences. Realizing politeness in social contacts depends on the interpretation of interlocutors in communication. If applied strategies damage a hearer’s face, it can be understood through interlocutors’ reaction or response (Watts, 2003). For example, in English culture, it is common to use ‘please’ as a routine politeness formula to request. However, it can take sarcastic or ironical meaning in different settings. Therefore, ‘please’ is a conventional request formula, but not a necessary one (see also Saberi, 2012, pp. 36-7).

More generally, what a turn accomplishes can be altered by the context in which it occurs. In part to deal with this, researchers have used analysis frameworks like conversation analysis (Golato, 2005; Heritage, 2005, 2009; Izadi, 2015, 2016, 2017; Kasper, 2004; Schegloff, 1980,
Kasper (2006) focused on how rational analysis and conversation analysis (CA) look at data differently. For example, speech act analysis mainly focuses on “making assumptions about the speaker’s intention” (p. 284) and provides different interpretations of the dialogue. In conversation analysis, it is the interaction which should primarily be taken into account. It engages with sequence and “temporal organization of turns” (Kasper, 2006, p. 301). Conversation analysis suggests that the way a speaker/hearer responds to the other’s utterance is largely based on what an addressee meant. This perspective does not go beyond the actual dialogue between participants to see what prompted them to talk or act differently. However, it does directly consider how people display themselves by means of responding to the interlocutor’s utterance.

### 2.3.1.3 Third wave politeness research

While the second wave had a strong interest in emic perceptions of politeness, a third wave, discursive politeness approach, has turned increasingly to interlocutors’ perceptions of politeness, not to conventionalised politeness or shared contents of politeness, to analyse politeness (e.g., Grainger et al., 2015; van der Bom & Mills, 2015). In comparison to politeness theories that utilise the Gricean Cooperative Principle and speech act theory, so-called postmodern approaches centre around participants’ understanding of politeness (Terkourafi, 2005) that deals with first-order politeness (see Eelen, 2001; Watts, 2003; Haugh, 2012). It concentrates on directly asking speakers of their understanding and rationale. Holmes (2006) stresses that by adopting the postmodern approach to politeness,

> “interaction is regarded as a dynamic discursive struggle with the possibility that different participants may interpret the same interaction quite differently” (p. 691).

This approach takes the entire interaction which is negotiated between individuals into account rather than looking for patterns in the number of linguistic strategies used. Examining the whole interaction can also illustrate the complexity of the requesting behaviour process where requests can occur with no specific requesting elements (e.g., “Can I”, “Could you” or “Would you mind…””) (van der Bom & Mills, 2015, p. 188).

Discursive politeness approaches, as discussed, draw attention to both the roles of speakers and addressees as they may vary the direction of communication at every turn (Holmes & Stubbe, 2015). In such politeness approaches, interlocutors’ interviews about the
appropriateness of language choices in different contexts may be used as a means of support to politeness interpretations (van der Bom & Mills, 2015).

The discursive approach argues that it is the participants within an interaction that are best able to judge or interpret what happens in that context. For this reason, there are a couple of fundamental critiques about previous politeness models in general, and the Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) account in particular, which were discussed before. Not just a critique of Brown and Levinson, discursive analysis itself exists for analysing politeness data and is concerned with how interactants perceive their relationship, what is appropriate to say in a specific situation and how dominance influences their social interaction (van der Bom & Mills, 2015, p. 182).

What van der Bom and Mills attempted is to change pragmatics scholars’ view towards the discursive approach to politeness. For them politeness is “a key element which is drawn on by participants when difficult interactional situations arise” (p. 194). They analysed the data by focusing on the participants’ judgements as well as their interpretation of the participants’ evaluations (see also Haugh, 2012). In one study, van der Bom and Mills’ (2015) data were contextualised among four close friends originally from Dutch and Italy. Their conversation was audio-recorded and then each of the speakers was interviewed separately to talk about their understandings and interpretations of politeness within it. Before doing interviews, the individuals were asked to choose a difficult part of the interaction. They were then asked about their own perceptions about what was going on in that extract. The results showed that the participants had slightly different interpretations of polite behaviour in that particular context.

2.3.1.4 Requests as conversations

Kasper (2006) indicates that in pragmatic analysis, we should look beyond the speech act itself as a single turn. Kasper argues “Interactional data are a necessary but not a sufficient condition for discursive pragmatics” (p. 284). Indeed, request data are composed of conversational tasks, rather than the single turn common in much data taking a speech act approach. Within the present study, for instance, a speaker could make multiple requests in the same conversation, each one varying in some manner from the one before. However, there is no established method for such broader analysis and different researchers have tried different approaches.

Conversational analysis is a robust method that focuses upon relationships between turns and the patterns they express. Turn-taking in speech or offers and invitations that are generally
accepted or declined (Schegloff, 1986) are examples showing a common complementary task. However, conversation analysis looks at a level of detail too fine-grained for the purposes here, which are to find general patterns of request development in interaction, not in a single conversation, but over multiple similar conversations. Rather than strict conversation analysis, Félix-Brasdefer (2012) analysed the spoken data in terms of three levels of pragmatics, which are actional, interactional and stylistic. His Spanish data were collected in a local market and the interactional analysis looked at the openings, request-response sequences and endings through which the interlocutors accomplished the task. The interactional level of the request-response sequence is less commonly used than conversational analysis in pragmatic studies of speech acts. An alternative approach to examining a conversation is that of Herbert Clark. Clark (1996) discusses that “the study of language in use must be both a cognitive and a social science” (pp. 25). He believes that both perspectives of each individual’s performance as well as of their action created as a pair must be focused on as a joint activity. However, Fusaroli, Rączaszek-Leonardi and Tylén (2014) show that we cannot fully understand the conversation as a joint accomplishment if looking at each question and response separately.

Inspiration for examining how semantic and procedural coordination works in a conversation can be drawn from Mills (2014). Mills studied a joint cooperation task through pairs of participants’ conversation scripts in a chat tool in which the participants cooperated to navigate each other to solve a novel activity (a maze game), identifying patterns of how semantics is negotiated over a conversation and coordination is progressed. Key insights from his work include the fact that the specific history of the conversation matters and that what the words refer to develops over time. This approach can be combined generally with models of discourse and narrative. These models use the concept of situation models “mental representations of the situations described in language” (Zwaan, 1999, p. 82; see also Kintsch, 1998; Zwaan & Radvansky, 1998) which are introduced, managed, and modified over a conversation or telling of a story. Combining these two models, we can think of the request as a joint task that the speakers wish to accomplish, identify the key elements of that task, and see how the task develops in the individual history of each conversation.

This study utilises key insights from this history of the study of politeness, believing that all can make a worthwhile contribution to the understanding of request behaviour. Three types of analysis will be performed: (1) analysing requests as speech acts examines the forms of individual request head acts and their related supportive moves, (2) analysing requests as conversations treats the request conversation as a joint task in which participants accomplish a
request together, and (3) analysing the participant perspective through interviews discovers their own emic, personal interpretation of their conversations. This complementary methodological approach hopes to gain the benefits of these methodologies, while compensating for each of their weaknesses. See Chapter 3 for further details.

### 2.3.2 Social Variables

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) argued that three contextual factors (P, D, R) influence politeness when individuals produce speech acts. They contribute to the weightiness of face-threatening acts, which determines the seriousness of FTAs as well as the level of politeness that each participant employs in his/her social verbal interaction. Kasper (1994) holds that there is “a positive correlation between the weight of contextual factors (social distance, power and imposition) and politeness investment” (p. 3209), and also allocates a large number of works explored the interrelation of these variables in politeness. Societal and cultural variables, including social power, social distance, the level of formality of the interaction, age, gender, speaking styles, ethnicity, social status of interlocutors and so on, contribute to the way people show or negotiate politeness. Therefore, this study is also motivated to measure the effect of these factors on Persian request choices.

#### 2.3.2.1 Distance

Distance (D) is “the value that measures the social distance between S and H” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.76). Note that ‘H’ represents a hearer and ‘S’ refers to a speaker. There are various substituted names for social distance such as: solidarity, familiarity and closeness; each of which was employed by specific groups of scholars. However, the variable distance is “the one which has received the most contradictory results, as well as criticisms” (Fukushima, 2000, p. 76). Holmes (1995) indicates that “the specific way social distance or solidarity is expressed linguistically differs between different cultures” (p. 14). In European contexts such as French, German, Italian and parts of Switzerland, singular pronouns (T) and respected pronouns (V) are used to be polite linguistically and to show the solidarity or social distance between people (p. 16). Holmes also made an example that in English culture, people generally make requests in a detailed proper way indirectly to strangers.
Le Pair (1996) observed that the study participants tried to use face-saving strategies when there is social distance between the interlocutors; however, when social distance was not significant, they communicated with interlocutors directly. Trosborg’s (1995) research showed that her English participants employed more conventionally indirect with their friends than with unknown people, while it is usually expected to use directness in close relationships due to the minor distance. The results of the above-mentioned studies have also revealed that the more similar social position between interlocutors, the more direct request strategies. Similar findings were discovered about refusal strategies of male Mexican Spanish learners in Mexican contexts, which conveyed “social power and social distance are conditioning factors in the selection of linguistic strategies” (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006, p. 2177).

The two studies of Félix-Brasdefer (2005) in Mexican Spanish, and Márquez Reiter (2000, 2002) in Britain and Uruguay followed Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) theory in relation to indirectness and politeness. Márquez Reiter examined the way Spanish males and females performed requests by considering social distance. When there was minimal social distance between interlocutors, they applied more direct request strategies. In Diaz Perez’s (1999) study, the English and Spanish participants tended to use conventionally indirect strategies if there was great social distance. It is seen in the above studies that there is a positive correlation between social distance and request direct strategies.

In contrast, Fukushima (2000) came to the opposite view that the bigger social distance between interlocutors, the more direct request strategies. Holtgraves and Yang (1990) also acknowledged that when there is a high degree of social distance in interaction, both American and Korean speakers used bold-on-record strategies. Baxter (1984) found that the friendly relationship between interlocutors was connected to politeness system but “in a manner opposite to that expected by Brown and Levinson” (p. 453). Blum-Kulka and House (1989) stated that the existence of accepted distance between the speaker and the hearer was not the main factor for applying interlocutors’ direct requests. The mentioned works have indicated a cultural difference where one culture mostly applies indirectness in unfamiliar interactions that brings greater politeness (Blum-Kulka et al., 1985; Fitzpatrick & Winke, 1979), while another culture uses directness in high level of social distance (e.g., Baxter, 1984). For example, in Persian, it is common that unfamiliar people behave towards each other with full circumspection and formality; it may, however, happen that they behave friendly in informal social meetings or associations where the distance among people is not important as much as is in normal social interactions or in academic settings. The findings of Salmani Nodoushan’s
study on Persian requests showed that the less social distance between the individuals, the more tendency of direct requestive strategies. It would appear “as if they [direct requests] have a potential for expressing camaraderie and friendship” (p. 272). In Abdolrezapour and Eslami-Rasekh’s (2012) comparative study on Persian and English requests, both external and internal mitigations were used at the same frequency by Iranians with large social distance, while the Americans preferred using external mitigation more than internal in the same situation.

2.3.2.2 Power

Power (P) refers to an asymmetrical social aspect where one of the interlocutors has an influence or authority over another in their interaction. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) introduce this social parameter as “a measure of the power that H has over S” (p. 76). Power is not always static, but can be “relational, dynamic and contestable” (Locher, 2004, p. 39). There are some equivalent terms, namely, ‘social power’ (Blum-Kulka et al., 1985; Fukushima, 2000; Márquez Reiter, 2002), ‘status’ (Kwon, 2004; Nelson, al-Batal & el-Bakary, 2002; Rose, 2000) and ‘dominance’ (Trosborg, 1995) used in the literature. As Brown and Gilman (1960) argue:

“One person may be said to have power over another in the degree that he is able to control the behaviour of the other. Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behaviour [...]. There are many bases of power-physical strength, wealth, age, sex, institutionalized role in the church, the state, the army or within the family” (pp. 255-256).

Baxter (1984) argues that “persons with power used less politeness than less powerful persons” (p. 427). She further found that gender was seen as a corresponding predictor of politeness that can be taken into account in addition to D, P and R (i.e., distance, power and rank of imposition). Lakoff (1977) showed that women mostly use polite language due to feeling unsafe compared to men. Following Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) account, Aeginitou (1994) discovered that Greek EFL students found social power to be an effective factor in the politeness system. In Fukushima (2000), the variable of power interacts with
request strategies positively in English and Japanese’s requests. In contrast to the studies mentioned above, along with several scholars (Blum-Kulka et al., 1985; Cansler & Stiles, 1981; Holtgraves, Srull & Socall, 1989), Cherry (1988), for instance, investigated formal letters written to the president of an American university and found out that power did not have a vital role on the persons’ request strategies. McLaughun, Cody and O’Hair (1983) discuss too, that power does not have an important effect on how the requesters made their requests.

It should be borne in mind that power is attributed to social roles that each individual plays, not their characteristics or personality. Power is manifested when individuals’ social status is determined (e.g., teacher/student, employer/employee and parent/child). Also, the social status of interlocutors affects face image in social communication (Scollon & Scollon, 2001). Holmes and Stubbe (2015, p. 3) discusses that linguistic power in the academic contexts may be manifested in a number of ways. For example, students of junior staff are obliged to follow the rules defined by university professors, university managers or senior staff. The results of their data show that “challenges to authority were typically expressed not with direct and confrontational strategies, but rather in socially acceptable or ‘polite’ ways, such as through the use of humour, including irony and sarcasm” (p. 7). In Persian academic contexts, such strategies are common and help politeness, although the extent and type of humour, irony and sarcasm are important.

Based on what Fraser (1978) notes regarding the importance of requests, Schauer (2009, pp. 25-26) agreed that it is important for second language learners to perceive the power and imposition of a situation and then to use appropriate request forms in that social status level (e.g., professor, student). In Abdolrezapour and Eslami-Rasekh’s (2012) study on Persian, social power of seniority resulted in externally mitigating the requests. Their conclusion shows that social power and severity of the request are the most important factors that influence the certainty of compliance in using mitigating devices for Persian requests.

2.3.2.3 Rank of imposition
The third factor, rank of imposition (R), deals with the level or degree of force of a speaker’s request on an addressee. For Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) the rank of imposition refers to “a value that measures the degree to which the FTA \( x \) is rated an imposition in that culture” (p. 76). Based on Fukushima’s (2000) study, the size of imposition depends on factors such as
time, effort, financial burden and psychological burden on the part of the addressee. He continued that, “standpoint towards imposition is to include rights and obligations, since imposition will also be influenced by whether the requester has a right to make a certain request and whether the requestee has an obligation to pursue the request” (p. 88). Imposition is further defined as “how great the request you are making is” and the answer is decided by the cost of what is being asked for (Thomas, 1995, p. 130). He refers to Goffman’s notion of ‘free goods’ and ‘non-free goods’ to explain the value of what is being asked. Consistent with Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) theory, imposition is generally used to indicate that each individual most likely has different perceptions or judgement about the severity of request interaction.

The level of imposition can be varied from culture to culture as Brown and Levinson addressed: “R is a culturally and situationally defined ranking of impositions” (p. 77). Therefore, the degree of positive and negative politeness can be modified based on a specific culture in which the act is made. The kind of polite strategy depends on the amount of imposition, the closeness of interlocutors, and the authority of a hearer over a speaker. For example, they also noted that when the rank of imposition of a request is trivial but the relationship between interlocutors is not close and the power is over one of the interlocutors, the speaker employs an off-record strategy while the same strategy may probably be applied when the imposition is high in close relationships and there is no power.

The significance of imposition was seen in the results of some studies such as Fukushima (2000) and Schauer (2007). For example, Fukushima found the variable imposition influenced the speaker’s request linguistic choice in different contexts. Similarly, Schauer’s study of EFL learners of Germany has demonstrated that the interactants all employed “a considerably larger variety of external modifiers in situations involving a high imposition request” (p. 211). The studies conducted by Brown and Gilman (1989), and McLaughun et al. (1983) have shown that greater imposition brings more politeness showing consistency with Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) model.

It is needed to figure out the relation between form, meaning and the seriousness of context in which the request is solicited (Gordon & Lakoff, 1975; Searle, 1975). As already mentioned, to Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) requests are inherently face-threatening to the hearer’s negative face. They are seen as face threats to an addressee due to the imposition of a speaker’s request on him/her. So they maintained that there are some well-formed and conventional statements in each language that help speakers to make polite requests such as greetings,
mitigators (*please, pardon me, thank you, and excuse me*) and conventionally indirect requests for communication. It is common for many languages, particularly Western languages, to employ conventionally indirect in formulating requests like, ‘*Could you possibly close the door?*’ to show politeness, though it does not cover all languages. For example, some languages like Persian commonly use hedges (e.g., *please*), prefabricated words (e.g., *just* and *I believe*), discourse markers (e.g., *Ok* and *alright*) and other supportive moves beside the core head act. However, some polite expressions in two languages look similar in function, but may be unsuccessful in social settings in one of the languages. The situation determines whether a demand is normal, and context itself lessens the force of the requested action if the addressee is not in the position of doing the action. Thus the above social factors influence verbal language selections.

In several studies, other variables as well as situational contextual factors have been disputed such as the hearers and speakers’ right and duty (Blum-Kulka & House, 1989; Held, 1996), the interlocutors’ age (Blum-Kulka et al., 1985; Held, 1996; Rintell, 1981), gender (Blum-Kulka et al., 1985), the seriousness of the situation ‘R’ (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006), the amount of face threat (Baxter, 1984), the purpose of request, the context and the medium (Blum-Kulka et al., 1985). They can also be considered as dominant parameters to make a request. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) state that “there may be a residue of other factors which are not captured within the P, D, and R dimensions” (p. 16). But, what would be important is that some of these factors can be found in Brown and Levinson’s P, D and R variables. For example, rights and duties can join in P and R.

A foundational concept within Brown and Levinson’s theory beyond the discussed social variables is that of face.

### 2.3.3 Face

The notion of face is considered foundational in politeness theory. In spite of the fact that face was first characterised by Goffman (1955), Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) face has become the centre of attention for much politeness research. Compared to Goffman’s (1967) perception of face as “something that is not lodged in or on his body, but rather something that is diffusely located in the flow of events in the encounter” (p. 7), Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) propose the meaning of face based on a cognitive and individualistic idea influenced by a rational model person:
“The public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself, consisting in two related aspects: (a) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. freedom of action and freedom from imposition, (b) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or ‘personality’ (crucially including the desire that self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants” (p. 61).

From Goffman’s (1955, 1967) viewpoint, face, which is attributed to each individual from the members of a particular social group, has the feature of changeability from time to time. On the other hand, based on Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) perception, one type of face is the desire to be accepted by the members of society (positive face), and the other type of face is the desire to not be imposed on by the members of society (negative face). Watts (2003) argued that Goffman talks about individuals’ social value as flexible in the ongoing process of verbal interaction, while Brown and Levinson examine a concept of face which is not changeable.

One debate taking place concerns the relationship between politeness and face in verbal interactions. If politeness is determined by seeking, maintaining, and threatening face, should we consider them equal? If so, then we deliberately change the meaning of politeness into face. By that token, any utterance that supports face must be considered linguistically polite, but this is not the case (Watts, 2003). Haugh and Bargiela-Chiappini (2010) support that face and politeness should be examined separately.

Much effort has been made to re-conceptualise face away from Brown and Levinson’s definition, including naturalistically (e.g., Bargiela-Chiappini & Haugh, 2009; O’Driscoll 2011; Terkourafi, 2008), by rejuvenating Goffman’s conception (Locher & Watts, 2005), or in a way that meets socio-constructivist view (Arundale, 2006, 2009, 2010). As indicated earlier, Goffman (1955) introduced the notion of face as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (p. 5). It is easiest to understand his definition through an example. If booking an appointment is mandatory for visiting a doctor, when one does not follow this way, s/he will not gain positive social value from the community, i.e. other visitors in a clinic.

For Watts (2003) face “will take place during the ongoing interaction” (p. 127). He maintains that, if an individual is a new arrival in a community and does not know enough information about that culture, then s/he will probably lose his/her self-esteem by doing something wrong among the local people. Watts further adds:
“one’s own face and the face of others are constructs of the same order; it is the rules of the group and the definition of the situation which determine how much feeling one is to have for face and how this feeling is to be distributed among the faces involved” (p. 6).

Arundale (2009) argues that Goffman presented face as a valuable personal belonging which shows itself or comes up while interacting as it is “diffusely located in the flow of events in the encounter” (Goffman, 1967, p. 7). Arundale (2009) further discusses that although the work of Goffman was the first advanced method on face and facework in the 1950s, his conceptualization of notion of face is not practical anymore. Arundale’s argument is that “face belongs to the dyad or social unit, and hence as ‘our connection and separation’ or ‘our face’” (2010, p. 2090).

Following Arundale (2010, 2013), Don and Izadi (2011, 2013), and Izadi (2015, 2016) view face as an interactional achievement. Inspired by this, the thesis will look at requests themselves as an interactional achievement. Izadi (2015) discusses that “face emerges in relationships and is conjointly co-constituted in interactions” (p. 84). Every single social communication has the potential to create bonding or separation between individuals. As Arundale (2013, p. 117) discusses, face is able to be independently created or extended in relation to actual social bonding or disconnection, which can be discovered through conversation analysis of what people achieve in their interaction (Izadi, 2016, p. 16) rather than through the analyst’s evaluations (Eelen, 2001).

It has been a main theoretical move to focus on politeness analysis from the perspective of all interlocutors in talks on face rather than from only speakers’ perspective on face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Haugh (2007, 2013) discusses how politeness can be evaluated without analysts’ interpretations. Meta-pragmatic and meta-participants (both speaker’s and addressee’s judgments) should then be taken into account for the precise interpretation of politeness while no one’s interpretation is put into first place or prior than the other one.

The next section introduces Persian politeness including key emic notions and also reviews the studies of politeness in Persian.

2.4 PERSIAN FIRST-ORDER POLITENESS (ADAB)

The concept of culture is a complex or collection of customs, beliefs, values, traditions and
conventions that are shared by a group of people. Culture affects people’s social manner and evaluations of “the ‘meaning’ of other people’s behaviour” (Spencer-Oatey, 2000, p. 4).

In Persian culture, there is a comprehensive notion, *taarof*, which refers to a cultural manner of meaningfully engaging with politeness protocols across differentiated settings (Mir-Djalali, 1992). As *taarof* is known as a multiple meaning term, various English definitions are found in bilingual dictionaries (Persian to English), such as ‘respect’, ‘deference’, ‘courtesy’, ‘flattery’, ‘gift’, ‘offer’, ‘honeyed phrase’, ‘modesty’ and ‘reserve’ (see Aryanpour & Aryanpour, 1976; Haim, 1987; Steingass, 1992). Sahragard (2003) introduces *taarof* with a set of five concepts: “1. *adab* (politeness), 2. *ehteraam* (respect), 3. *rudarbaayesti* (being shy or ceremonious), 4. *tavazu?* (humility) and 5. *mehmaan-navaazi* or *mehmaan-dusti* (hospitality)” (p. 405). It can then be stated without hesitancy that *taarof* is an enormously complex subject to translate into other languages as it does not fit easily into other cultures. This is the critical point for researchers and linguists in pragmatics: adhering closely to the definition of politeness in a culture as well as being comprehensible cross-culturally (Haugh, 2012).

Although *taarof* is a commonly used notion in Persian pragmatics, there is controversy over its precise definition. Beeman (1986) was apparently the first to employ ‘ritual politeness’ for *taarof* and some scholars (e.g., Koutlaki, 2002) continue to apply this phrase. On the other hand, Derkich (1386/2007) argued that *taarof* cannot simply be translated as ‘ritual politeness’ because *taarof* refers to a wider scope within cultural productions and this translation may carry a negative meaning. Therefore, *adab* can describe politeness in Persian culture due to two reasons; first, *taarof* embodies a multitude of concepts, not just politeness, and second, there is a lack of consensus about the equivalent among interlanguage researchers. In this regard, Wong (2016) states that “when we use complex English to describe speech acts used in other languages and cultures, we impose an English perspective onto the object of the study. We understand other cultures from the perspective of English” (p. 829).

A modern definition given for *adab* in one Persian dictionary is: “suitable behaviour according to the norms of society/raftar-e pasandide mutabegh ba hanjar-ha-ye ejtemaei)” (see Amid, 1993; translated by the author); modern thinkers employ this definition in their pragmatics studies on *adab*, which identifies the values and social norms of Iranians. There is also a long list of English synonymous for *adab* by Steingass (1992, p. 28) such as being

---

5 This reference was published in Iran using the Iranian calendar. The researcher has mapped the Iranian calendar year to the Gregorian calendar year.
courteous, polite, the essence of polite learning, well-bred, respect, reverence, morality, chastisement, sound doctrine, etc. This indicates that it covers the broad meanings that are difficult to fairly express in one English word or phrase. A Persian report entitled *adab chist? aya Iranian mardomani moaadaband?* ‘What is *adab*? Are Iranians polite people?’ also notes:

“The truth is that being courteous and being polite are largely tied to the concept of culture. Naturally, every country with a long history of global civilization has produced more products in the field of culture. This is an important part of being polite, but not the whole story. Courtesy as the main criteria is used to calculate the real part of social behaviour and interactions of people with each other” (Moayerinezhad, 1391/2012;\(^6\) translated by the author).

*Adab* is the positive and practical result of appropriate and successful *tarbiyat* ‘upbringing’, as Koutlaki (1997) maintains that

“an Iranian’s upbringing (*tarbiat [tarbiyat]*) aims at producing an individual that will be a helpful family member and a useful member of the social groups he will belong to. His behaviour must follow the prevalent social conventions so as not to be offensive to others” (p. 65).

*Adab* is mainly achieved “through personal development that includes learning” (Sahragard, 2003, p. 406). Individuals who practice *adab* are socially expected to behave suitably in their communication based on social conventions as well as to do good deeds. Age, gender, distance, social power and social status are the dominant factors in expressing politeness as discussed in section 2.3.2. The hierarchical order is very important to Persians and chiefly determines showing *adab* along with *ehteram*, ‘respect’, as Sahragard (2003) discussed: “Persian culture places great emphasis on having *ehteram* (respect) for superiors” (p. 419). *Ehteram* is one of the emic concepts of Persian face (Koutlaki, 2002; see section 2.4.1).

---

\(^6\) This reference was published in Iran using the Iranian calendar. The researcher has mapped the Iranian calendar year to the Gregorian calendar year.
Polite behaviour also matters in Iranian academic contexts like universities where there are generally rules and regulations that juniors and seniors are familiar with. Complimenting seniors can represent one aspect of taarof in which nice or even flattery words are usually used and is well-accepted in Iranian society in general, and in academic contexts highlighting junior-senior relationships in particular (Izadi, 2016, p. 15). Repetition of praising or thanking, tamjid kardan, might also be used to prepare the context to approach one’s purpose. However, Izadi discusses that professional contexts such as academic defences include large audiences in Iranian universities and are a type of situation where people may perform less taarof and rudarbayesti in their social interactions. Rudarbayesti is a cultural complex related to the concept of taarof which represents shyness, no inclination to refuse or say negative response to any offer, request or invitation. Being in rudarbayesti is the result of accepting unwanted offers or requests. Izadi noted that as individuals create and modify any sociocultural context, they weigh how much taarof is appropriate or necessary. The number of audience, the history of relationships between individuals, the familiarity of the given contexts and the importance of topics--or even stable individual factors such as self-esteem--can influence the extent of these two cultural practices. Perhaps those with high self-esteem may practice taarof differently than low self-esteem people.

Further, professors in Iran who follow academic regulations pay particular attention to equality between all students. Compliments or offers from juniors can create situations that put seniors in rudarbayesti. Thus, being fair is one of the reasons for professors to resist or reject the students’ frequent taarof and flattery, charb zabani. However, juniors have less power over professors and therefore seniors may decline juniors’ requests. It may be because common conventional hierarchical situations do not allow a mutual practice of taarof or hiding criticism to maintain politeness.

Based on the participants’ evaluation within Sharifian and Babai’s (2013) Persian refusals study, many Persians can hardly say ‘no’ to seniors. Accepting seniors’ offers shows a kind of respecting. In requestive situations, complimenting, appreciating and thanking seniors are considered as respecting acts that juniors often make. These could be staged communicative acts; however, they show how people try to create a strong and deep close relationship or to present a polite image of themselves. Although practicing taarof where inappropriate or irrelevant is viewed negatively (see Izadi, 2016; Locher, 2004), it is routine and generally practiced in different places. However, different forms of politeness as a social form of practice is used in Iranian society depending on interlocutors and the given context (Izadi, 2016).
Persians do different evaluations on *taarof* in different discourses. That is the reason that, when one practices *taarof* frequently even in friendly contexts, s/he will be attributed ‘*taarofi*’ (derived from *Taarof*) because putting companions prior to him/herself shows how much care one pays to them.

*Taarof* practices more often happen in contexts with close bonds, such as between two close friends, or in a familiar relationship with less power for an addressee over a given situation, such as student-departmental manager (Izadi, 2016). It is also common that before asking for their favour or requests, people will repeat *ba man taarof nadashte bash* ‘do not do *taarof* with me’ to avoid putting pressure on their addressee, instead making her/himself at ease to be able to make the decision or whatever s/he thinks appropriate. For example, in the excerpt below, two close friends were discussing if the requested money complied with the addressee’s situation. Both speaker and addressee exchanged several turns in which mitigation and *taarof* phrases were practiced to avoid the pressure of accepting the request for the addressee and the unpleasant feeling of asking for money for the speaker. This is just one example of *taarof* and it can take different forms.

S: *hala baz fekrato bokon ta chand roz-e ayande.*
Think about it again in the next couple of days.

No, I do have. I think that I can make it, no it’s okay. Yes, 300-400 Toman (the amount of money) is not a problem. It’s okay.

S: *motmaen basham?*
Are you sure?

H: *are are. Na alan, man hesab kardam cheghadr vaghean pol to bankam daramo ina.*
Yes, yes. No now, I just calculated how much money I have in my bank account.

S: *na hala baz dobare ajalei nist. Man hastesh. Vali ta 2 hafte dige ta 5shanbe age behem begi, kheyli khob mishe.*
But again, it’s not urgent. I have some. But, if you let me know by the next two weeks, until Thursday, that would be great.

H: *na na okay hast.*
No, no, it’s okay.

S: *taarof nadarim.*
We don’t have *taarof*.

As discussed already, the other cultural complex related to *taarof* is *rudarbayesti* in which addressees ignore their condition because of a speaker’s request and the speaker’s need takes priority over any other matter. Being considerate of what the requestee can afford to give is a critical component of polite requests. As Izadi addressed, “Complaints about unhappily accepting a request due to *rudarbayesti* are rife in Iranians’ every day narratives” (p. 15); practicing this schema also receives unhappy evaluations because people are not able to reject and say ‘no’ to what they cannot afford physically, mentally or financially. It is common that Iranians criticise themselves due to accepting unwanted offers or requests unhappily and recommend themselves to have courage to reject or say ‘no’ to unpleasant favours or not to be stuck in such situations. In this current study, the exposure to a foreign context like New Zealand as an egalitarian society might affect participants’ ideology or judgements.

Further, over-politeness is a familiar evaluation of social interaction among Persians; it can be a positive or negative evaluation depending on the given context. Izadi (2016) discusses that professional contexts like universities are not usually such *taarof*-rich contexts where nice words are repeated and criticism is hidden when there are failures. However, in some familiar and friendly contexts, practicing *taarof* is appropriate and appreciated. The type of context and topic could influence the participants’ acceptance. Izadi (2016) employed conversation analysis to evaluate over-politeness in Persian and how a professional conversation is created in three different academic contexts. These discourses happen in two oral defence sessions and a departmental meeting. He looked at *taarof* and *rudarbayesti* as societal norms in those settings. In the dissertation oral exam, practicing compliment-response sequences created a strong relational close connection between the two examiners with the same academic ranking; Izadi noted that “[it] invokes a normative ‘polite’ gesture” (p. 18). In another dissertation oral exam, a PhD student’s compliments to the examiner, which is well-accepted and practiced in Iran, was viewed as over-politeness because the student interrupted the examiner and his supervisor then stopped the student. In contrast to the common belief about this cultural practice, this example shows that complimenting seniors can be viewed as “differentiation-separation and over-polite” (p. 19). His last study example is an exchange between staff and the head of department about the promotion of a staff member. In order to avoid ‘differentiation-separation’ with the senior members, the junior staff avoided raising her
promotion issue and her willingness to teach certain courses. When it was insisted that she raise it, instead she practiced *taarof* and *rudarbayesti* to show the insignificance of her issues, which were regarded as inappropriate by other colleagues. Izadi, in line with Locher (2004, p. 90), argues that over-polite acts may be viewed negatively.

As face might be involved with over-politeness, it is important to see whether face exists in Persian and if it is useful in analysing *adab*. The following section discusses emic notions of face in Persian and the history of the term in Persian politeness research.

### 2.4.1 Persian Face

Koutlaki (2002) studied two folk concepts of face in Persian. The first concept is *shakhsiyyat*, which is translated into English as ‘character’, ‘identity’, ‘individuality’, ‘personage’, ‘self’ and ‘personality’ (see Aryanpour & Aryanpour, 1976; Haim, 1987). These dictionary definitions are close to those of Koutlaki’s (2002, p. 1742) who describes *shakhsiyyat* as ‘personality’, ‘character’, ‘honour’, ‘self-respect’, ‘pride’, and ‘social standing’. She states an individual’s *shakhsiyyat* “is mainly dependent on the way s/he behaves and his/her educational background and is often perceived as related to the socialisation and upbringing she has received” (p. 1742). Also, if a speaker respects her/his interlocutor’s *shakhsiyyat* appropriately, it will promote his/her own *shakhsiyyat* as well. In other words, there is a mutual relationship between interlocutors’ *shakhsiyyat* in communication as well as a direct connection with *adab*. Koutlaki discussed “a person’s sˇaxsiat [*shakhsiyyat*] is perceived as indicative of a person’s self-respect: the more polite a person is, the more sˇaxsiat [*shakhsiyyat*] s/he has” (p. 1742).

The second concept dealing with Persian face is *ehteram*, which refers to English equivalents such as ‘deference’, ‘regard’, ‘respect’, ‘respectability’, ‘revere’, ‘reverence’, ‘courteous’ and ‘obeisance’ (see Haim, 1987). In Iranian society, *ehteram* is the result of politeness, especially through the use of suitable address forms (Koutlaki, 2002). For Sahragard (2003) “any polite behaviour, in other words, can be regarded as the cause for Ehteraam [*ehteram*]” and “any verbal or non-verbal act performed out of respect can be considered as Ehteram [*ehteram*]” (p. 407). It is thus created when societal norms are observed and followed by interactants. Koutlaki (2002) states that individuals’ *shakhsiyyat* often influences *ehteram*. One who is characterised as the holder of a high *shakhsiyyat* receives a great level of *ehteram*.

Mapping between social and linguistic concepts, Koutlaki found *ehteram* and *shakhsiyyat* are compatible with Goffman’s notions of deference and demeanour respectively, which
people should avoid doing behaviour that violates their own deference and demeanour. When there is no balance in social conventions and inappropriate social forms are used by the speaker, it can easily lead to a face-threatening situation for an addressee due to forming a different relationship (see Beeman, 1986, pp. 73-77). Koutlaki (2002) argues that “Chinese face and Persian face as well, are oriented towards an ideal social identity, or public face” (p. 1739). According to Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 62), positive face which refers to “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others”. This differs from Persian face, *shakhsiyyat*, as in Iranian communication, an addressee’s *shakhsiyyat* is offered in relation to social rules about face. Following those social face rules is important because loss of face is more likely to happen by behaving inappropriately. As a result, it affects the speaker’s social status. Koutlaki’s (2002) data and findings acknowledged that in different Persian interactional settings, strong insisting on *taarof* and repeating thankful expressions enhance a listener’s face as well as a speaker’s face “in showing generosity and hospitality” (p. 1754).

Izadi (2015) discussed that there are two Persian emic concepts, *aberou* (*vejhe* is also used) and *shakhsiyyat*. He views the folk notion of face, *aberou*, to some extent, differently from those of Goffman’s (1967) and Koutlaki’s (2002). Following Arundale (2010), Izadi holds a view that *aberou* is built of relationship and social connections in which one’s *aberou* is largely dependent on people’s conversation about him/her. Izadi further discusses that maintaining *aberou* “(âberu [aberou] dari)”, or in other words, *tars az aberou* (fear of becoming without *aberou*), leads one to behave and interact with other community members properly (p. 85). Maintaining *aberou* and maintaining social relationships are subject to achieving *ehteram* through practicing *taarof*. Depending on the extent to which *taarof* is practiced between Persians, a certain degree of closeness or distance is built up and even re-created.

Although factors such as social position, age and interlocutors’ interpersonal relationship contribute to the face of an addressee, the preceding discussion shows that the emic concept of face in Persian culture is an achievement, not a possession. This is why Arundale (2010) argues that the notion of face is that of something constructed in interaction, not possessed.

### 2.4.2 Requests in Persian

The way speech acts are used across languages involves sociocultural rules, universal principles, and politeness. Through cultures, different social interactional forms and styles are
created to convey a message, leading to various expectations and interpretations (Eslamirasekh, 1993). Notions like sincerity or solidarity convey different interpretations in various cultures. I therefore review briefly studies on requests in Persian.

The relationship between politeness and indirectness has seriously been examined by Blum-Kulka (1983, 1987, 1989), Walters (1979), and many others. There is a strong relation between indirectness and politeness, i.e. the higher indirectness, the more politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987; Leech, 1980, 1983; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 1999; Weizman, 1989). However, Blum-Kulka (1987) discovered that different speakers perceived the connection between indirect requestive strategies and politeness differently, though directness remained important. For example, in Hebrew, American and British English, and German native speakers’ views, conventionally indirect requests were seen as more polite than hints, even though hints are more indirect (Blum-Kulka, 1987). ‘Could you…?’, ‘Would you mind…?’ and ‘Why don’t you…?’ are conventional requests and they were considered more polite than non-conventionally indirect requests. Eslamirasekh (1993) maintains that in some societies like Persian, external and internal modifications preceding or following requests play a crucial role in politeness rather than directness/indirectness. Therefore, wordiness makes Persian request conversations longer than English requests. Similarly, Rintell and Mitchell (1989) commented that the length of speech acts (e.g., requests) is taken into account in measuring the degree of politeness; “having more and/or longer supportive moves in requests in particular can contribute to a perception of the request as more elaborate and therefore more polite” (p. 266).

Eslamirasekh (1993) compared the similarities and differences of the speech act of request made in Persian and English using a Discourse Completion Task (DCT). In this method, participants are given a request situation and asked to complete the discourse with an appropriate request. Persian university students made more direct requests compared to American native speakers in all given settings. For example, 70% of the Persian requests favoured direct strategies, 25% favoured conventionally indirect and around 4% hints, whereas American English requests preferred 12% percentage of direct, 79% conventionally indirect and 7% hints. The higher level of directness in the Persian requests compared to the American requests show that cultural differences affect interlocutors’ request choices. In other words, the level of politeness in cultures cannot be determined by the level of directness/indirectness. The different request choices in English and Persian did not strongly indicate that English speakers were more polite than Persians (Eslamirasekh, 1993). Eslamirasekh’s results also show that
using second person pronoun rather than first person pronoun as the subject in Persian requests is more common. For example, ‘Could you possibly help me in carrying this bag?’ is preferred to ‘Could I ask you to do me a favour?’ Eslamirasekh’s reason is that American culture embraces individuality, freedom of action, and no imposition (i.e., negative politeness), whereas Persian culture social cohesion and group solidarity (i.e., positive politeness) (pp. 96-7).

Despite Eslamirasekh’s (1993) results, the Persian data collected by Salmani Nodoushan (2008) showed that from 2232 requests across six different social scenarios, 16% and 72% of requests were direct and conventionally indirect respectively, quite different from the findings of Eslamirasekh. It should be noted that Salmani Nodoushan’s corpus was larger than Eslamirasekh’s, but used the same method (DCT) in collecting the data. Perhaps other methods like a natural corpus or role play may show different results. Both Eslamirasekh (1993) and Salmani Nodoushan (2008) show that the frequency of imperatives or imposing requests upon addressees increase as social distance decreases. Salmani Nodoushan’s study showed that the less social distance between the individuals, the more tendency for direct requestive strategies. It would appear “as if they [direct requests] have a potential for expressing camaraderie and friendship” (p. 272).

Moreover, Salmani Nodoushan and Allami (2011) look at the types of supportive discourse moves in Persian requests across formal, semi-formal and informal settings. 2232 request utterances, collected from a DCT, were analysed following Scollon and Scollon’s (2001) politeness model, which uses three key parameters of hierarchy, deference and solidarity. The purpose of this request study was to investigate whether the core head acts were used alone, included internal supportive moves, were followed by external supportive moves, or accompanied by either internal or external modifications. Of the 6048 strategies taken from the responses, 33% and 67% were internal and external supportive moves respectively. The results indicated that the native Persian speakers were apt to apply internal and external moves for request head acts in the different contexts so as to balance the seriousness of requests as well as be more polite. The conclusion also suggested that the number of external modifications used by the participants exceeded internal ones. Overall, the highest number of internal and external discourse moves belonged to the hierarchical politeness system (+Power, +Distance), the lowest number were belonged to the solidarity politeness system (−Power, −Distance), and the deferential politeness system (−Power, +Distance) fell between those politeness systems. The
outcome of their study is similar to the results of studies that focused on German and Polish cultures (Pavlidou, 2000; Wierzbicka, 2003). However, the authors claimed that the findings gained in their study may not be attributed to all Persians. They made an attempt to show a possible sample of Persian requests in the different given interactional settings. Different analyses like a discursive or conversation-oriented approach in analysing speech acts might identify different politeness results.

Abdolrezapour and Eslami-Rasekh (2012) examined the influence of mitigating devices on request compliance in two cultures, American English and Persian. The corpus analysed through four open role play prompts showed that across the different power situations, American English speakers applied more internal modifications in their requests, such as down toners (e.g., possibly) and conventionally indirect structures, whereas external modifications were frequently used by Persian-speakers, such as reasons and preparing strategies. Use of mitigators (e.g., please) was interpreted differently in the two cultures. The Persians’ aim for using mitigators was to ensure the requestee complied with the request, while the Americans found that its frequent use may express sycophancy. Alternatively, the Americans considered conventionally indirect as a mitigator uninfluenced by social power, while in Persian, the use of mitigation devices directly depended on the severity of a request and the power of an addressee (Abdolrezapour & Eslami-Rasekh, 2012, p. 158). In evaluating this claim, the authors highlighted that “Iranian society is built around hierarchical relations and social power is one of the most important factors that people consider when they engage in conversations” (p. 160).

Saberi (2012) examined the routine politeness formula in Persian using data from Persian soap operas, role plays and native speaker linguistic and cultural intuitions through introspection. In his thesis, ‘downgraders’ as politeness markers in Persian, such as lotfan, bizahmat, ghorban-e dastet and khabesh mikonam, had a key role to modify a bare direct/imperative utterance to a milder polite request. Their function is like ‘please’ in English or ‘bitte’ in German (see House, 1989), which are generally employed in asking for small demands or services in routine contacts. They can also be preceded by alerters, which draw the addressee’s attention to the coming request (Blum-Kulka, 1989, p. 277) as optional elements. Apology expressions and terms of address are employed as alerters and can come either before or after the request head act in order to soften the request (Saberi, 2012).
The way people judge their politeness and their interlocutor’s politeness might relate to their individual differences, as well as overall cultural patterns, particularly self-esteem, as it deals with self-worthiness and evaluation about behaviour. The next section will discuss if this individual factor contributes to request conversations.

2.5 SELF-ESTEEM

Without a doubt, how individuals think about and look at themselves is concerned with their behaviour (Dörnyei, 2005). Making requests in a particular setting may be face threatening to both interlocutors so appropriate requests are socially expected. People tend to build a very desirable image of themselves (Hogg & Vaughan, 2002), which recalls what Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) proposed for positive and negative face based on the rational model person: “The public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself” (p. 61). Watts (2003, pp. 22, 121) pointed out that everyone would like to feel respect for himself and keep ‘self-esteem’ in social and restricted places. Making a positive and appropriate self-image can be partly affected by the worth that a person feels. Covington’s (1992) study on a ‘self-worth’ theory of motivation argues that the “search for self-acceptance is the highest human priority” (p. 47). Coopersmith (1967) stated that when people achieve favourable goals, they can assess themselves as prosperous and worthy individuals. Therefore, it is possible to hypothesise that a person’s self-attitude along with his own judgement likely relates to his decision about linguistic choices.

2.5.1 Definition of Self-Esteem

It is necessary here to clarify exactly what is meant by the term self-esteem. A great deal of previous research in the field of psychology has endeavoured to introduce and to investigate the concept of self-esteem (Allport, 1937; Baumeister, 1999; Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger & Vohs, 2003; Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991; Cooley, [1902] 1964; Coopersmith, 1967; Epstein, 1973; James, [1890] 1983; Rogers, 1951; Rosenberg, 1965, 1979, 1989; Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach & Rosenberg, 1995; Sherif & Cantril, 1947) as it has a pivotal role in everyday life. James ([1890] 1983), a pioneer in studying self-esteem, introduced self-esteem as an affective phenomenon which exists as a feeling or an emotion. An individual’s self-esteem is associated with success. When people think of their probable success or failure, it affects their social communication dealing with “risk-taking, decision-making, and the
strategies adopted in problem solving” (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 23). If a request conversation is taken as a means of solving a problem, then self-esteem may affect language choices in the request conversation. It would be interesting to see the relationship between self-esteem and making requests. Rosenberg (1965) who extensively worked on self-esteem through a socio-cultural approach summarised it as “a favourable or unfavourable opinion of himself” (p.15). In his view, self-esteem is a product of the influences of culture, society, family and interpersonal relationships.

One early academic investigation of self-esteem by Coopersmith (1967) introduced self-esteem:

“By self-esteem, we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which an individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self-esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes that the individual holds towards himself. It is a subjective experience which the individual conveys to others by verbal reports and other overt expressive behaviour” (pp. 4-5).

In Coopersmith’s study, both subjective and behavioural expressions in relation to self-esteem were used to assess if preadolescents’ judgement about their self-esteem and their performance are in harmony, and to determine how their self-attitude manifested in their body language, posture and performance. It was also remarked that “self-attitude formulation relates the study of subjective experience to the study of other cognitive processes as well as of other verbal behaviour” (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 22). Therefore, “verbal expressions of attitude with more overt behavioural manifestations” were employed to examine different attitudes (p. 7). A positive self-descriptive report sample is seen below:

“I consider myself a valuable and important person, and am at least as good as other persons of my age and training. I am regarded as someone worthy of respect and consideration by people who are important to me. I’m able to exert an influence upon other people and events, partly because my views are sought and respected, and partly because I’m able and willing to present and defend those views. I have a pretty definite
idea of what I think is right and my judgements are usually borne out by subsequent events. I can control my actions toward the outside world, and have a fairly good understanding of the kind of person I am. I enjoy new and challenging tasks and don’t get upset when thing don’t go well right off the bat. The work I do is generally of high quality and I expect to do worthwhile and possibly great work in the future” (p. 47).

This study shows some of the many common words used in daily interactions that contain evaluative implications. Perhaps the way people judge their politeness and their interlocutor’s politeness relates to their self-esteem as it deals with self-worthiness and evaluation about behaviour.

Others also focus on evaluation. Blascovich and Tomaka (1991) defined self-esteem as “the overall affective evaluation of one’s own worth, value, or importance” (p. 115). Similar definitions can be seen in Stanwyck (1983, p. 7) “how I feel about how I see myself” and in Bednar, Wells, and Peterson (1989) who maintain that self-esteem is a form of subjective feedback about the adequacy of the self. Self-esteem has come to be used to refer to the manner of personal evaluation towards one’s own personality, whether giving a sense of desirability or not.

Although self-esteem has been described in different respects, there are also some other related names interchangeably used (e.g., self-worth, self-regard, self-respect, self-acceptance), which have similar dictionary meanings with the notion of ‘esteem’ attributed to one’s self (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). However, self-concept is a broader notion that includes self-esteem, self-efficacy and self-identity (Rosenberg, 1976). Similar to Miller and Moran (2012) and Purkey (1988), Rosenberg (1976) refers to self-concept as the “totality of the individual’s thoughts and feelings with reference to himself as an object” (p. 2). Crocker and Major (1989) argued the “awareness of how others evaluate the self and the adaptation of those other’s views combined to form the concept of self” (p. 610). During people’s lives, self-concept is being changed from childhood to adulthood (Rosenberg, 1979).

Self-esteem is the evaluative component within self-concept (Gergen, 1965; Rosenberg, 1965) and increases self-concept through its appraisals (Crocker & Major, 1989). It is broadly conceived as a global sense of value and worth (Purkey, 1988). Thus it is a rather stable feature of an adult individual’s personality across time compared to other individual variables. In fact,
“self-esteem cannot be manipulated in a truly experimental manner” (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991, p. 117):

“Believing that one is a terrible singer may be a part of one’s self-concept but may not bear any relation to one’s feelings of self-worth. Feeling mildly or severely depressed because one cannot sing, however, is a matter of self-esteem, as is the behavioural consequence of jumping off the roof of an 18-story building to end one’s humiliation over this deficiency” (p. 115).

Moreover, Hogg and Vaughan’s (2002) study indicated that there is a close correspondence between self-esteem and social identity because group members are recognised through the group’s social status, which is closely connected to one’s self-concept. Similarly, Canfield and Wells (1994, p. 215) hold a view that self-esteem correlates with the identification of people’s identity and is one of the prerequisites to having relationships, which connects self-esteem to politeness.

2.5.2 Dimensionality of Self-Esteem
Maslow ([1954] 1970) drew the attention of readers to the crucial roles of self-esteem, respect of others and respect by others as human needs and motivations. He described two different forms of esteem: the need for respect from others and the need for self-respect, or inner self-esteem. First wave politeness, with its focus on face, holds that the abstract concept of politeness gains specific significance when a speaker intends to respect his/her addressee’s face verbally. If speech acts are opposed to the face needs of either interlocutor, then face is threatened. Face can therefore be viewed as a socio-psychological concept, which may be affected by self-esteem as a psychological individual difference.

Maslow’s ([1954] 1970) definition of self-esteem is similar to the Persian politeness (adab) concept of ehteram ‘respect’, as an emic notion of Persian face, discussed in section 2.4.1. Ehteram is compatible with Goffman’s notion of deference (Koutlaki, 2002) which refers to “the appreciation an individual shows of another to that other, whether through avoidance rituals or presentational rituals” (Goffman, 1967, p. 77). Therefore, self-esteem might change people’s language choices for showing respect to others and being respected.
Self-esteem reflects personal and global feelings of self-worth, self-regard, or self-acceptance (Rosenberg, 1965). Global self-esteem refers to “individuals’ overall evaluation or appraisal of themselves, whether they approve or disapprove of themselves, like or dislike of themselves” (Higgins, 1996, p. 1073). In the 1990s, global self-esteem has been identified as the most studied individual differences variable among ID variables (Baumeister, 1999). Rosenberg et al. (1995) have examined global and specific (academic) self-esteem, which may lead to remarkably different outcomes. These types of self-esteem were measured through linear structural equation causal modelling; the results of the study showed that global self-esteem deals with psychological healthiness, and specific self-esteem with behaviour, which “is a much better predictor of school performance” (p. 141). The following example is provided to get a better understanding about global and specific types of self-esteem: “a student may have attitudes toward her university as a whole, but she may also have different attitudes toward a specific department, the quality of the faculty, or the attractiveness of the campus” (Rosenberg et al., 1995, p. 142). The importance of specific self-esteem has been recognised in many works (e.g., Harter, 1982; Marsh, 1986; Marsh & Shavelson, 1985; Swann, 1987), but studies sometimes fail to note the differences between global and specific self-esteem. They are not synonyms and cannot be interchangeably used.

Too little attention has been paid to the significance of self-esteem in pragmatics. For instance, Dörnyei (2005) stated that this concept is not significantly covered in second language research. One of the reasons is that there is a relative similarity between the notions of self-esteem and self-confidence. Like self-efficacy, which has common features with both self-esteem and self-confidence, self-confidence deals with an individual’s beliefs regarding his/her personality or traits as an individual. More research has been carried out on self-confidence (Dörnyei, 2005). Another reason for the disregard of self-esteem may deal with the correspondence of their measurements (see Valentine, DuBois & Cooper, 2004). It is often assumed that self-esteem is self-confidence, though they are different. Self-confidence is about how we feel about our abilities and it can vary from time to time, while self-esteem is a rather stable feature of adult’s personality across time.

While there has been considerable attention to and concerns with the issue of self-esteem improvement in psychology, how it influences people’s linguistic behaviour has been under-researched. In this regard, Dörnyei (2005) has evaluated theories presented by Baumeister (1999), Covin, Donovan and MacIntyre (2003), Raffini (1996), and Valentine et al. (2004) to analyse the boundaries between low and high levels of self-esteem for a comprehensive
understanding of their impacts on individuals’ performances. Perhaps variety (differences) in request behaviour lies in self-esteem, as its significance was also declared by Brown (1994): “Self-esteem is probably the most pervasive aspect of any human behaviour” (p. 136). Note that this thesis also aims at exploring the role of self-esteem in encountering failures or feedbacks, responses, and achievement, that a speaker receives from his/her own requestive performance.

2.5.3 Self-Esteem Levels

Generally speaking, cheerfulness, calmness, success and such positive symptoms are the signs of high self-esteem (Hannell, 2012, p. 1), and so a high level of self-esteem is shown by statements such as “mostly I like myself a lot”. Low self-esteem refers to “a sense of personal inadequacy” (p. 6), so negative feelings, perceptions or sentences such as, “I do not really like myself much” are associated with individuals’ low self-esteem (p. 1). In experimental studies, individuals high in self-esteem are more eager to be involved in social activities actively, and are comfortable in sharing ideas, while individuals low in self-esteem are characterised as less able to cope with pressure (Coopersmith, 1967). Carlock (1999) states that low self-esteem has been connected to “depressions, poor relationship choice and tangentially associated with many other symptoms” (p. 3). It is therefore not far-fetched to speculate that different levels of self-esteem can affect individuals’ decision about verbal request strategies in different contexts. It should also be mentioned that the consistency of self-esteem assessments over time supports the general view regarding the stability of self-esteem level.

Baumeister (1999) evaluated the difference between people with low self-esteem and those with high self-esteem, and whether their behaviour and learning were affected by high/low self-esteem. The results showed that individuals with high self-esteem are more tolerant of failures, whereas low self-esteem people have trouble dealing with psychological aspects of daily routines.

Based on Covington’s (1989) study, learners who had high self-esteem gained higher grades, while the achievement scores went down when self-esteem was low. Students with high self-esteem are also more certain about their objectives because they are more aware of the goals they are looking for (Raffini, 1996). High self-esteem is therefore able to facilitate goal achievement. Individuals with high self-esteem are more proud, effective, zealous, and important, but those with low self-esteem feel they are anonymous, unworthy, and dishonourable (Mack, 1983; as cited in Richardson, 2003). However, Dörnyei (2005)
maintains that many people with remarkable features and qualities do not show them, “whereas others seem to have a staggeringly positive impression of themselves, a sort of ‘inflated ego’” (p. 212). He also concluded that the reason for this difference between the two levels of self-esteem is due to “an underlying deep-seated, trait-like disposition” (p. 212). Showing high self-esteem, whether consciously or unconsciously, may assist individuals in defending and coping with likely threats in relation to their self like failure, inability or social denial (Schneider & Turkat, 1975; see Lyubomirsky, Tkach & Dimatteo, 2006).

Perhaps negative effects of low self-esteem lead to poor decision making or poor language selections in request speech acts. Fear of making a wrong, poor or face-threatening choice might be the other consequence of low self-esteem. Self-esteem might even contribute to the creation of situations that then lead to such choices.

2.6 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study’s purpose is to explore how sociocultural and psychological variations influence the range of request strategies used in Persian. An attempt is also made to see if Persian requests are as formulaic as previous studies on request speech acts have indicated (e.g., Eslamirasekh, 1993; Saberi, 2012; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011). To do so, it seeks to find answers to the following questions, based on a controlled yet quasi-normal speech data through an open role play method along with interviews.

1. How do social distance, sociocultural power, and self-esteem influence request behaviour in Persian?
2. How do Persians accomplish a request dialogue as a joint activity?
3. Why are particular request choices made in different academic Persian situations? What are the reasons?

Looking at Persian requests not as a single turn, but as a joint accomplishment, might identify the process of how people discuss and perceive polite behaviour in different situations. It is therefore an open question whether requests are best interpreted as a single turn, a classic speech act analysis, or as a conversation, an interactional analysis – or whether there is one best analysis.
Exploring both sociocultural and psychological variations in one study works together. Our individual psychology will affect the sociocultural decisions we make. Self-esteem in particular is argued to be, by some researchers, a continuing, long-lasting part of a person’s personality, and not variable situation to situation. Therefore, the starting point was to see how some stable part of psychology relates to a cultural performance like politeness.

However, they are not truly independent. An individual and their psychology develop in a specific culture, which could affect self-esteem even if it is stable. People with different psychologies will likely also have different cultural experiences. For instance, they may have more experiences in certain types of situations or tasks. This will therefore potentially affect how they use their language in cultural contexts. At the same time, if one culture does something in a way that is more accessible to people of a certain personality and another culture does the same thing in a way that is less accessible, then the same psychology will have different experiences in different cultures. So, both really do loop back upon each other. Because of these complexities, it suggests that we should be studying the two more often, and not ignoring individual personality when looking at cultural language use. It is possible that the ideal method has not been found yet, but it is an important task.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the sociocultural and psychological predictors, social power, social distance and self-esteem, in request conversations among Persian native speakers using overlapping speech act-analytic, conversation-analytic and interview-analytic techniques. This chapter reviews the options for studying request behaviour and justifies open role play as most appropriate for the study’s research questions. It then describes the participants, the instruments used for data collection, the data collection procedures, and the reliability of validity of the tools. This Methods chapter also discusses overall data collection. How speech act, conversation-based and interview-based analysis were performed is documented in Chapters 4, 5, and 6, one chapter for each type of analysis with findings.

3.2 LITERATURE ON DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES IN PRAGMATICS

Several methods for studying speech act behaviour have been developed including written discourse completion tests/tasks (DCTs), fictional dialogue, such as in novels or in television programmes, role plays (closed and open) and a natural corpus. It is widely believed that the most authentic and reliable method is to solicit speech act data through real-life observations (Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Cohen & Olshtain, 1994; Izadi & Zilaie, 2015; Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989; Wolfson & Manes, 1980). However, Saville-Troike’s (1989) suggests that “There is no single best method of collecting information on the patterns of language use within a speech community” (117). Rose (2001) stresses that there are some limitations with each of these data collection methods (some of their pros and cons are addressed in the following sections). If each method has limitations, one alternative is to apply several together, known as ‘triangulation,’ in a single study to
overcome the biases of each alone (see Aijmer, 1996, p. 5; Félix-Brasdefer, 2010, p. 53; Grainger & Mills, 2016; Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985; Saberi, 2012; p. 42). The following sections first review features of common instruments in pragmatic research, natural corpus, DCT, role play and stimulated recall interview and then discuss how the research method fits into this study.

3.2.1 Natural Corpus
Collecting data through observation of spontaneous real-life speech is often regarded as the most authentic and reliable method for anthropological and pragmatic studies (Wolfson, 1986). This method provides what individuals say in their real-life situations rather than what they want to say or think in those contexts (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993). Some cross-cultural and monolingual research has gathered naturalistic data in evaluating speech acts (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1991; Hahn, 2006; Izadi & Zilaie, 2015; Nittono, 2003). For example, Nittono (2003) examined the use of hedging in Japanese by a natural corpus of conversations from those who had equal social status, mainly friends. Hahn (2006) collected naturally-occurring apologies in Korean contexts by noting occurrences encountered over daily life over more than a year. Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1991) collected naturally-occurring data through observing native and non-native university students during office hour advising sessions.

However, the spontaneity of natural conversation can make it difficult to investigate some research questions and it can face limitations in meeting interlanguage speech act studies’ purposes (e.g., Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Boxer, 2010; Cohen, 2004; Félix-Brasdefer, 2003, 2007, 2010; Kasper, 2000; Kasper & Dahl, 1991). One issue is that it is difficult to significantly control contextual variables (e.g., academic background, gender, age, social status, similar contexts, Kasper & Dahl, 1991). For example, Izadi and Zilaie (2015) employed a natural corpus to look at Persian refusal speech acts. The collected refusal data were audio-recorded and field notes (see Holmes, 1990; Wolfson & Manes, 1980) were taken around an Iran university. The exchanges included real naturally occurring refusals as well as deliberate naturally occurring refusal initiated by one of the authors. After recording and noting the refusal interactions, permission was obtained from interactants, and their demographic details were gathered and included in the study. However, the data could not be controlled under comparable similar social and contextual situations such as topic, imposition, relationship, social status etc. in order to identify comparable results across conversations. In monolingual
speech act studies like this thesis, it is necessary to look at language production in similar contextualised situations involving non-linguistic variables such as interlocutors’ age, gender, occupation, etc.

Reality TV shows are a useful source of naturally-occurring corpus as they can provide spontaneous data and speed up the data collection process. For example, Scott (1998) analysed the disagreement speech act through American TV talk shows. However, the problem of controlling contextual variables remains. It has also become popular to apply soap operas to speech acts studies as it is not time-consuming like observing natural speech. Soap operas are generally described as a television drama series typically dealing with daily lives of the same group of characters. Characters usually follow the scripts written based on the ordinary language at that current time. Although prewritten scripts used in soap operas are created by a native speaker of a given language who has a knowledge of the current spoken language in that society, they may not represent thought-out language choices because they are not spontaneous and so may differ from a natural response. Saberi (2012) used 14 soap operas as the main method along with role plays and further discussions with the participants to document routine politeness formulae in Persian. Zeng (1996) used a Chinese film to study interrogatives. Although using this source of data collection would be an easier task compared to natural corpus, speeding up the time of data collection, it is still not spontaneous and is not repeated over multiple participants to find broad patterns.

Even if natural data are not the primary source of language data, observing natural speech can help to design real-like situations for other instruments. Studies conducted by al-Issa (1998) and Kryston-Morales (1997) employed Discourse Completion Tasks inspired from observing authentic data. The former investigated refusal speech acts in American English and Jordanian Arabic, and the latter studied complimenting in English Americans and Puerto Rican Spanish native speakers. The next section examines DCTs, arguably the most popular choice for pragmatic study.

### 3.2.2 Discourse Completion Task

The discourse completion task (DCT) has been a favourite method for speech act research (Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Kasper & Dahl, 1991). Kasper and Dahl define the DCT as a written questionnaire containing short descriptions of particular situations with a prompt for the participant to complete the situation. In their study, DCTs were used in 19 interlanguage pragmatic studies of the 39 studies, with 13 of the total studies employing role plays. Also, in a
volume on requests (Alcón-Soler, 2008), half of the 10 studies used DCTs and role play: 2 studies DCTs, 2 studies role play, and one both DCTs and role plays.

DCTs “measure offline pragmalinguistic or sociopragmatic knowledge in a non-interactive format” (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010, p. 45). DCTs allow researchers to collect a large amount of data in a relatively short time and to create model responses for the participant. For example, researchers like Beebe (1985), Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), Olshtain and Cohen (1983), and Salmani Nodoushan and Allami (2011) used the DCT procedure in the investigation of speech acts across different languages. Kasper and Dahl (1991), and Cohen (1996) suggest that DCT data can be used to develop linguistic performance in authentic discourse, such as in teaching or coaching situations. Along with Wolfson (1989) and many others, Kwon (2004) argues that the DCT also “allows researchers to control the variable of the situation (e.g., status of the interlocutors) thereby providing a consistent body of data” (p. 341). Davis and Henze (1998) held the view that although authentic data may represent the ideal methodology to examine pragmatic speech act behaviour, a naturalistic corpus may not produce enough data for detecting high frequencies of the pragmatic feature, such as indirectness, mitigation and politeness (Kasper, 2000) in symmetrical and asymmetrical interactional contexts.

Although DCTs are controlled elicitation instruments for data collection (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; DeCapua, 1998; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989; Trenchs, 1995), there are some drawbacks to using them. First, the DCT is in a written form; respondents are required to produce written answers, so its value is not equal to a spoken form (Morkus, 2014). Participants also have sufficient time to think about the most appropriate form of answers, which may differ from naturally occurring speech acts (Barron, 2003; Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Watts, 2003). Next, respondents may change their answers if they do not like the one that they first wrote, so respondents have a chance to render what they think is the most frequent, successful answer, while in real life, people need to make speech acts immediately and they cannot avoid their inappropriate sentences if they accidently make a mistake (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985). Data collection and data analysis through the written DCTs are simpler than naturally-occurring data as they deal with a single turn; this simple method is, however, limited as actual speech acts, such as requests, almost always occur within a larger conversation (Morkus, 2009). Billmyer and Varghese’s (2000) discussion states that, compared to traditional DCTs, DCT scenarios enriched with contextualised factors are able to evoke more elaborate and rich data, more similar to natural data. However, even an enriched DCT does not provide the truly interactive experience of natural conversation. As discussed above, DCTs are sufficient for
collecting basic request speech acts, but not for looking at how speech acts fit into a conversation. It generally focuses on the role of speakers and ignores the addressees’ determining contribution, but natural conversations are verbal and include more than one person. Therefore, the next method is able to meet the needs for gathering a quasi-normal speech.

3.2.3 Open Role Play

In role plays, two interactants are asked to act the specified roles orally within a predefined situation face-to-face. Role plays are as a “measurement of online (pragmatic) knowledge” (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010, p. 47). There are two role play methods: closed and open (Kasper & Dahl, 1991). The closed role play asks a speaker to perform a speech act with his/her interlocutor orally with a single turn and there would be no more interaction between them. It is similar to an oral form of DCTs in that there is no further negotiation. In open role plays, participants generate a quasi-natural conversation regarding a topic with multiple turns. The latter is of interest because it creates interactional situations like real-life contexts and enables researchers to observe individuals’ pragmatic features more than the closed one (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010; Gass & Houck, 1999; Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Morkus, 2014), as well as how interlocutors’ pragmatic competence is practiced in a spontaneous manner (Barron, 2003).

Traditional role plays described a situation with details but not with broad non-linguistic variables. For example, in the apology study of Demeter (2007, p. 84), one of the scenarios is “You did not have time to change before going to the wedding of your best friend, and therefore you are wearing sports clothes.” Another role play scenario about refusing a friend’s birthday party invitation is “A friend of yours invites you to his birthday party next Friday evening. He is inviting a selected group of friends over to his house, and you are one of them, but you can’t make it” (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010, p. 48). These scenarios could have described the context with more non-linguistic details such as interlocutors’ age, their occupation, the place of the conversation between interlocutors, etc. to help speakers imagine the situation and act it out semi-naturally. Félix-Brasdefer (2008) discussed the content validity of such scenarios in a pilot study by two study groups of American and Mexican speakers. The participants observed that further contextual details such as the location of event and the level of closeness could have been provided for the situations as those specific descriptions could have influenced the participants’ answers.
Context-enriched role plays (Billmyer & Varghese, 2000; Félix-Brasdefer, 2002) differ from traditional role play prompts, in that they do provide detailed background information (Morkus, 2009). Previous research findings into role play have also shown that scenarios those which provide more contextualised information can yield prolific data resembling real-life speech (Billmyer & Varghese, 2000). For example, this enhanced open role play request-refusal prompt was used in a refusal study by Morkus (2014):

“You are taking a class on the history of the Middle East and you are one of the best students in class. You are also known among your classmates for taking very good notes during the lectures. Yesterday the professor just announced that there would be an exam next week. One of your classmates, who you don’t interact with outside of class, and who misses class frequently and comes late to class, wants to borrow your lecture notes for the exam. You have previously helped this student several times, but this time you just feel that you cannot give him the lecture notes again” (p. 103).

However, such prompts with long description or more details might not always be helpful to speakers as it takes time to remember all the details and they limit the natural performance of speakers because they may wish to include only what was written in the scenario in their conversations.

Compared to natural data, open role play can provide controlled, repeatable social situations (Márquez Reiter et al., 2005) and also “a clear assessment of the social variables (e.g. social distance, social power, imposition, age, occupation, dialect) at play in those social contexts” (p. 6; see Demeter, 2007; Félix-Brasdefer, 2003). Turnbull (2001) discovered that his data collected by the role play resembled real-life data in many ways, although there was a key difference that the role play data inclined to be longer and included more repetitions. The open role play is considered a semi-ethnographic method (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985). It suits generating certain speech acts (e.g., requests), which typically involve extended interactions and negotiation between interlocutors (Bataller, 2010; Edmondson, 1981; Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985; Sasaki, 1998). Oral face-to face interactions through role plays usually come with negotiations (Kasper & Dahl, 1991) which include non-verbal signals such as body movements, facial expressions, hesitations and turn-taking, which appear in real-life contexts.
Félix-Brasdefer (2010, p. 53) argued that enriched role play prompts enhance the validity of the method. For example, in Félix-Brasdefer’s (2002) study, the role play prompts contained detailed information about the interlocutors’ age, gender, and academic background. Similarly, Morkus (2009) applied enhanced open role plays effectively for his data collection. The addressee in the role play learns about the interaction as it is happening, but s/he will not be already aware of “the speaker’s communicative goal” (Márquez Reiter et al., 2005, p. 6; see also Félix-Brasdefer, 2010). Therefore, the interlocutors’ pragmatic practice can be observed in unplanned conversations (Barron, 2003). One of the advantages of using this sort of instrument is “to analyse how the strategies that constitute the speech act set of refusals or requests evolve across the interaction, over various turns, and with presence of prosodic features such as intonation and stress” (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010, p. 53). However, Félix-Brasdefer noted that either written or oral stimulated data which are significantly designed for research purposes “can hardly be equated to speech act data drawn from natural discourse” (pp. 53-4).

The open role play method can be easily replicated (Tran, 2006, p. 3) which provides the opportunity to have data audio-/video-taped for further precise analysis (Abdolrezapour & Eslami-Rasekh, 2012). If enriching role play prompts are used for data collection, the number of scenarios should then be limited; however, the diversity of contexts would be affected (Félix-Brasdefer, 2010). Therefore, this study used only four open role play prompts enriched with contextual variables in conjunction with different social power and distance differences because the higher number of prompts, the more details participants have to remember. Numerous scenarios can also extend the length of the experimental session beyond a reasonable time (see section 3.4.1).

In comparing a DCT with naturalistic and role play methods, the cross-cultural pragmatic studies by Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1992), Rintell and Mitchell (1989), Sasaki (1998), and Turnbull (2001) concluded that data elicited by DCTs are significantly different from role play data in terms of frequency and length of responses. Margalef-Boada (1993) also argued that data collected by open role play are a more valuable indicator of natural verbal communication than the data by a DCT. Morkus’ (2014) refusal study showed that “the open role play method, therefore, seems to be a more effective data elicitation tool in cross-cultural speech act research” (p. 89; see also Rosendale, 1989). From the studies reviewed above, it appears that open role play can yield speech act data resembling authentic discourse to a large extent and are closer to real-life data than written DCT data.
Certain drawbacks associated with the application of open role play methods have been raised. Prompts designed by researchers might seem unreal or fake to participants (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993) as the individuals may not have been in a similar context before. Thus, it may lead to unnatural behaviour from interlocutors (Jung, 2004). Golato (2003, p. 93) points out that it may look that participants are conversing to each other but they are actually playing roles in a given situation that is not real to them. Chang (2006) maintains that “Subjects may exaggerate the pragmatic interaction in performing role plays, producing a speech behaviour which would not have occurred in a real-life situation [...]” (p. 7). In addition, participants may try to give the researcher what they want, which could threaten the validity of the study (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Atasheneh and Izadi’s (2011) used role play to study Persian requests and found positive and negative aspects. On the one hand, the role plays were lengthy like natural speech. On the other hand, some of the responses seemed to be based around unnatural prompts and were not the same as those found in a corpus. There is also burden in transcribing the role play data that takes a while (Kasper & Dahl, 1991), which limits the amount of data that can be analysed.

To avoid unnatural behaviour, this study employed common academic situations, which the researcher, having been an Iranian postgraduate student in Iran, knew could happen in many Iranian postgraduates’ academic lives, by asking them to imagine they were in different situations in Iran before acting out the given roles. The influence of imagination in linguistics has been addressed by scholars, including Lepore and Stone (2015), whose work deals with interpretive reasoning that interlocutors can exploit. They “turn to cases whose content is not resolved conventionally, but that instead require imaginative, productive inference on the parts of audience, and where speakers regularly anticipate and prompt such inference” (p. 4). Imagination and being imaginative are not separated from the essence of the one who imagines his feeling, desire, past and future. His imagination, background, experiences, country and contexts are interdependent. This study, therefore, asked participants to imagine their homeland, Iran, before request role plays through which they can position themselves inside imaginary given Persian settings.

In sum, role plays were selected as the best option for collecting data for the current study. Role play allows for particular social contexts to be re-created face-to-face and verbally across multiple pairs of both speakers and addressees, recorded and analysed in detail. They also allow for a full conversation so that requests can be studied as both a single speech act and a
conversation. Role play sessions were followed by interviews of participants to learn how they thought of what they had just done.

### 3.2.4 Stimulated Recall Interview

In a stimulated recall interview, individuals are asked to reflect on what they did, said or performed in the past. Through verbal report, it can be understood how much/far participants’ ideas or approaches are different from each other (Gass & Mackey, 2000). There are several studies investigating the accuracy of verbal report. For example, Ericsson and Simon (1998), and Lieberman (1979) confirmed that verbal report does correspond closely with actual performance. Félix-Brasdefeir (2010, p. 54) also discussed that verbal report is able to approve whether the data collected through “DCTs (concurrent reporting) or role-plays (retrospective reporting)” are authentic and reliable.

Cohen (1987, p. 84) divides the data obtained from verbal report into three categories: self-report, self-observation and self-revelation. Self-report data familiarise the researcher with how someone describes their behaviour or themselves, which may be based on generalizations rather than the specific event to be reported on. Self-revelation, also known as think-aloud, is an ongoing report by participants about their thought process while talking or performing an act. Self-observation as one of the verbal reports can be collected either introspectively as the event occurs or retrospectively (usually 20 second later); in Schauer’s (2009) study, the stimulated recall interview is introduced as a retrospective reporting, a form of self-observation. The main difference between these retrospective or introspective reports is the time between performing/playing an act or expressing a statement and reporting the task. The shorter time between the expression and the report, the more accurate the data because a longer period can negatively affect the memory to recall (Gass & Mackey, 2000; Schepens, Aelterman & Van Keer, 2007; Seung & Schallert, 2004). Stimulated recall should be done as soon as the event was finished, since some participants may have the time to edit or forget their ideas, or to express inaccurate reasons for their statement or behaviour (Seung & Schallert, 2004; Sime, 2006). Bloom (1954; as cited in Gass & Mackey, 2000, p. 18) pointed out that prompting recalls within 48 hours lead to 95% accuracy of data. That is why this study employed introspective stimulated recall reporting right after the task was finished.

Gass and Mackey (2000) introduced the stimulated recall interview in which the researcher and participants watch a recorded video of the participants, along with limited general
questions from the researcher to the participants. The videos display the performance of the participants but do not directly reveal what the participants were thinking at that time. Thus, the researcher, by conducting the stimulated recall technique, can specify how participants’ statements or acts are associated with the way they perform. The main advantage of stimulated recall data is that it provides an opportunity for participants to talk about their decision (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Sime, 2006; Stough, 2001). Therefore, video-recording role plays allowed participants to watch their request conversations for improved recall and enables interview discussions on what the participants had just performed.

To develop Gass and Mackey’s (2000) stimulated recall technique, Schauer (2009) found out, from her pilot interview, that using only back-channelling signals such as ‘okay’ in an attempt at non-interference from the researcher made the interview conversations unnatural. Therefore, she proposed an interview technique in which the interviewer is allowed to ask further general questions as well as maintain the verbal report element, termed a semi-structured interview. If the participants made more general observations regarding pragmatics, these were followed up as well to obtain a better understanding of participants’ perceptions of linguistic/pragmatic features (p. 78). In Grainger and Mills (2016), natural language data, role plays, interviews, questionnaires and focus groups were administered to look at politeness in interaction with a different analysis impressed by the discursive analysis (see section 2.3.1.3). Discussions through stimulated recall interview with the participants were also done to support the data analysis. In the current study, all participants first received instructions about how the interview would work, then observed the recorded video of themselves in role play in order to better recall their performance and request strategies, and then were asked questions. All interviews were conducted as a group with the researcher and both participants.

### 3.2.5 Questionnaire

Self-esteem is a critical aspect of many choices of personal behaviour; however, there is no consensus about its measurement (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). Background questionnaires and inventories, self-report (Coopersmith, 1967) and performing a task have been employed to evaluate the level of individuals’ self-esteem. Farnham, Greenwald and Banaji (1999; as cited in Dörney, 2005, p. 213) proposed that standard self-reports can be used to assess self-esteem in which respondents measure their different performances as well as determine their feelings
about the tasks they have produced. However, there is a difficulty with that: Respondents may evoke highly positive self-esteem toward themselves and manipulate the results. Farnham et al. (1999) offer a technique, the Implicit Association Test, which asks participants to categorise a group of words (e.g., classify self-words & pleasant words from self-words & unpleasant words) on a computer monitor. If the participants can do it faster and achieve a desirable result, then this measurement technique shows a high degree of implicit self-esteem.

In one early analysis of 33 self-esteem measures (Crandall, 1973), the Janis–Field Feelings of Inadequacy scale (Janis & Field, 1959); the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (SES) (Rosenberg, 1965); the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory (SEI) (Coopersmith, 1967); and the Tennessee Self-Concept scale (Fitts, 1965) were more reliable. Blascovich and Tomaka (1991) reached similar conclusions from reviewing the popular self-esteem scales, excluding the Tennessee Self-Concept scale, for adolescents and adults. The Janis–Field Feelings of Inadequacy scale, the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory and the Tennessee Self-Concept scale are multidimensional and evaluate various attitudes of self-concept; however, Rosenberg’s scale provides a measure of global self-esteem and so has frequently been used in research. As the Janis–Field Feelings of Inadequacy scale measures different aspects of social and academic skills, and self-regard (Fleming & Watts, 1980), Heatherton and Wyland (2003, p. 225) suggest scholars employ it when it is needed to measure different dimensions of self-esteem like academic self-esteem. Demo’s (1985) test, which examined eight self-esteem measures (a projective, personal interviews, self-reports and rating by others), found that Rosenberg’s and Coopersmith’s self-esteem scales had high reliability based on factor analyses.

Blascovich and Tomaka (1991) hold the view that none of the self-esteem measures are satisfactorily accurate, though of these, the Rosenberg self-esteem is the most popular scale applied in research. Gray-Little, Williams and Hancock (1997) discussed that the Rosenberg self-esteem scale is a reliable and valid assessment of global self-worth and “deserves its widespread use and continued popularity” (p. 450), because this scale has received more psychometric examination and empirical validity compared to any other self-esteem measures (see Byrne, 1996; Wylie, 1989). Another study on ‘measuring self-esteem in dieting disordered patients’ examined the validity of both Rosenberg and Coopersmith self-esteem measures to specify the appropriateness of their function. The outcome showed that “the SES has sounder construct and convergent validity than the SEI” (Griffiths, Beumont, Giannakopoulos, Russell, Schotte, Thornton, Touyz & Varano, 1999, p. 227). This study also reveals that the SES received higher correlation coefficients than the SEI.
“This difference between the two scales became more marked when multiple regression analyses were performed whereby only the SES significantly predicted the criterion variables used to assess construct validity. Therefore, the SES can be deemed to have good construct validity for this dieting disordered sample but the same cannot be said for the SEI” (p. 229).

Moreover, Persian studies have previously examined the dimensionality and applicability of the widely used Rosenberg (1965) self-esteem scale in an Iranian context (e.g., Beshlideh, Yousefi, Haghighi & Behrouzi, 2012; Khoshkam, Bahrami, Ahmadi, Fatehizade & Etemadi, 2012; Rajabi & Kajro Kasmai, 2012; Shapurian, Hojat & Nayerahmadi, 1987). For example, Shapurian et al. (1987) showed that 12 Iranian bilingual judges confirmed the soundness of translation. The reliability and validity of the Persian version of the Rosenberg questionnaire were studied in two samples of Iranian college students in both Iranian and American universities. Sample I consisted of 232 Iranian students in American universities, and sample II included 305 Iranian students in Iranian universities. The internal consistency was 0.81 and factor analysis of the Rosenberg scores confirmed the unidimensionality of the scale in this study, too. The other Persian work by Khoshkam et al. (2012) confirmed the internal consistency of 10-item Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale which was 0.88. Both of these studies used the Persian version of Rosenberg’s scale for the Iranian university students which is a similar population as sampled in the current thesis. Taken together, these analyses suggest that the Rosenberg SES as a unidimensional scale with popularity and accuracy is the most validated tool across many cultures and had been used in Iran with Persian translation before.

The original Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (SES) (1965) was created for use with adolescents and measures their global self-evaluations. This unidimensional scale asks the participants to express their feelings about the self. The scale for scoring ranges from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’ using a four-point response scale. The SES’ first version includes ten items, which is used in the current study, though there is another version, which consists of six items, particularly used for younger people than high-school students (Rosenberg & Simmons, 1972). The technical advantages like “ease of administration, scoring, and interpretation” (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991, p. 120) encourage many scholars to employ the SES in their studies as it is known as a standard measure compared to other self-esteem scales. Blascovich and Tomaka, however, also raised problems with the SES:
“the items may be susceptible to socially desirable responding. In addition, scale score distributions among college students tend to be negatively skewed so that even tripartite splits of the distribution produce “low” self-esteem groups that have relatively high self-esteem in an absolute sense” (p. 123).

This thesis employed Rosenberg’s (1965) 10-item self-esteem questionnaire, however, there are at least two risks. First, following Blascovich and Tomaka, it is possible that relatively low self-esteem participants will be absolutely high. Secondly, it is possible that there will be limited variation in self-esteem among participants in the study as self-esteem cannot be known before recruitment.

3.3 PARTICIPANTS

This research recruited 36 male Persian native speakers either studying or living in New Zealand. Their ages ranged from 27 to 45 years with an average age of 32.66. They were postgraduate students of different disciplines (e.g., information science, marketing management, tourism, computer science, food science, etc.) mostly in New Zealand universities (Otago and Canterbury), seven participants with MA degrees in Iranian universities and one participant who was a visiting scholar at the University of Otago in New Zealand at the time of data collection. The participants are from different cities of Iran, such as Tehran, Esfahan, Ahvaz, Kermanshah, Zanjan, and Mashhad. All were raised in Iran where Persian was spoken and all also completed their academic degrees, at least to bachelor’s level, in Iranian universities. They had lived abroad from one month up to 7 years (but not only in English-speaking countries). Although cross-cultural exposure might impact on either the way the individuals employ their mother tongue or perceive their own culture (Fukushima & Haugh, 2014, p. 169), it is worth examining how Iranians living and studying abroad perceive their own culture.

Since this study did not aim at studying the relation of gender and requests, the gender of participants was controlled. This exclusion is intended to avoid the influence of gender on emic understanding of politeness (p. 169). Male participants were chosen over female as there are more male postgraduate students from Iran studying in New Zealand. It should be noted, however, that the researcher is a female Iranian, though this was kept constant in all data
collection and interviews. The Persian speakers’ level of proficiency in English was not considered as all sessions were conducted in Persian. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of the participants.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persian participants</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speakers (those who made the request)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressees (those who received the request)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study sample of Iranian speakers was employed a focused group: postgraduate male Iranians in New Zealand. The thesis represents the choice to aim for depth with a small sample of people and a small sample of situations, rather than breadth. For example, gathering in-depth interview data from hundreds of people was not possible within timeframe of this study.

3.4 INSTRUMENTS

Observational and non-observational methods were used to collect data. Observational methods include audio- and video-recorded role plays along with audio-recorded stimulated recall interviews. The non-observational method was the Rosenberg (1965) self-esteem questionnaire.

3.4.1 Open Role Play

The content-enriched open role play in the current study consists of four different request scenarios written in the Persian language. All of the virtual situations were taken from common real-life academic situations (see Grainger & Mills, 2016) in Persian culture; two scenarios (e.g., asking for an extension on an academic project and borrowing class notes) are adapted from Salmani Nodoushan and Allami (2011) with modifications to meet the needs and describe the
context clearly, and the other two scenarios (e.g., borrowing some money from a close friend, checking an application status with the departmental manager) were proposed by the researcher. A pilot study was first done with eight proposed prompts by Iranian postgraduates in New Zealand to check how long the role plays take and the appropriateness of the situations in employing request behaviour. What was learned from the pilot study helped the design of the research as the proposed number of prompts was beyond the reasonable time to conduct the research. Of the eight scenarios, the four scenarios that were most effective in eliciting the data were selected. The need to enrich the prompts with more contextual features like educational settings was also learned. The place of cameras was tested in the pilots. From video-recording the role plays in the pilot, it was found out that participants needed to know where to sit or stand and how far they could move. What was further indicated was that it would be better to not watch the participants while they were performing in order to feel more comfortable in their interaction. Although the size of pilots were small due to small number of Iranian population in New Zealand, the pilots were extremely helpful.

The real-life situation topics in the current study were taken into account in the development of the role playing scenarios. The contexts portrayed educational settings of language use. These role play prompts describe the place where the event takes place, what the request topic is, the length of their acquaintance, age, occupation, and educational background. The four request prompts differed in topics, interlocutors’ social status, their status relative to each other, the mutual relationship between interactants and the object of each request. The size of imposition was intended to be consistent across all scenarios, which was indicated to be successful in the pilot study. However, the third prompt, in which one friend requests a loan from another friend, was indicated to be more imposing according to some participants in the stimulated recall interview.

In the first scenario with an asymmetrical power status, an MA student asks a professor to give an extension to complete a project (afterwards ‘Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario’). This is (translated from the Persian):

‘Imagine that you are a 24 year-old student studying for a Master degree in another city, far from your hometown. In the second year of your study, you have enrolled for a paper taught by a senior, distinguished professor. You are required to submit an essay by the end of the semester but you are sure that you will miss the submission deadline and therefore fail the class. You have made an appointment to go to your professor’s
office at the university and will ask for an extension, although you do not know him very well. Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.’

Note that the participants were asked to “act out the conversation”, rather than to “make such a request”, so it is natural for them to demonstrate a whole conversation.

The participants’ general observations and personal experiences added to the reliability of their role plays and to the validity of scenario topics. Although scenarios were virtual, the participants were asked to imagine each prompt in Iran and truly be themselves in the roles. In the interviews, most of the participants also claimed that they did not play any role and it was truly themselves like they are in real life. For example, Addressee 10 (low self-esteem, [SE]) talked about how he made his request to get an extension in real life.

\[\text{daghighan in senario baram etefagh ooftada. Va kamelan rooy-e rahkarhay-e darkhast fekr kardam va say mikardam jomla ro mosbat tar konam ke ostad barash sakht bashe ‘na’ goftan.} \]
\[\text{The same scenario exactly happened to me in the real context. I thought about the strategies carefully and tried to use positive sentences to make saying ‘no’ hard for the professor.} \]

Another example is speaker 5 (low SE) who made a comment

\[\text{man taghriban hamon dialog-e khodamo migam—hatta age 6 bar dige bazi konam.} \]
\[\text{I would repeat my dialogue almost the same, even if I played it six more times.} \]

While participants knew they were to perform a request, the participant being asked did not always respond affirmatively, but instead sometimes refused the request, another indication that they were considering the situation naturally.

As mentioned earlier, some participants found the third prompt with an equal status very difficult compared to other three scenarios; however, some of them believed that the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario was more difficult compared to this one. The third scenario describes a situation where two PhD students are close friends and the speaker asks to borrow some money from his friend (afterwards ‘Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario’).
‘Imagine that you are a thirty year-old PhD student. You and your close friend, who is the same age as you, are staying together in a university college this semester. You pay the accommodation charges monthly in advance; however, because payments from your scholarship have not begun, you do not yet have the money to pay. You want your friend to lend you this money. You will definitely return it by end of the month or earlier once you receive the scholarship allowance. After dinner in the flat, you ask. Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.’

All participants, both speakers (the ones making the request) and addressees (the ones being requested), received a card with the description of the settings that they were to perform. These cards (see Appendices D & E for both the Persian original and translation) describe the image of the person they had to play and the details of each prompt. For example, in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, the addressee’s card describes the request situation like

‘Imagine that you are a senior, distinguished professor teaching different papers/subjects for postgraduates at the university. As usual, you would like to receive the students’ essays on the due date. One of your students who is a 24 year-old man has made an appointment to talk about his essay. You do not know him very well. Please respond naturally in this role to the other speaker.’

The scenario titles which will be used afterwards through the thesis are as follows: ‘Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario’; ‘Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario’; ‘Friends-Borrowing Money (−P–D) scenario’; ‘Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario.’ Social distance and power were pre-determined and the settings of each scenario was only to describe the place where the event takes place. The settings did not affect the interlocutors’ status and the power/distance relationship in any of the scenarios. By definition, +Power means unequal and –Power means equal. Of course, power is in fact gradient, but is often considered categorically (equal or unequal) in the literature. The schematic structure of four scenarios is summarised in Table 3.2.
### Table 3.2

**Role Play Scenarios across Different Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Variables</th>
<th>Educational setting</th>
<th>Object of request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+Power, +Distance]</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>A MA student asks a professor to give him an extension to complete a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−Power, +Distance]</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>A MA student asks an unfamiliar classmate to borrow class notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−Power, −Distance]</td>
<td>University college</td>
<td>A PhD student asks his close friend to borrow some money from him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+Power, −Distance]</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>A postgraduate student asks his departmental manager to check his application’s status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situations above were developed based on the social variables of social power and distance by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). Therefore, the first situation belongs to the hierarchical positions (+P+D), the second situation belongs to the non-hierarchical positions (−P+D) and the third one belongs to the solidarity positions (−P−D) (Scollon & Scollon, 2001). The last situation is (+P−D). Analysis techniques for role play data are discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

#### 3.4.2 Stimulated Recall Interview

The stimulated recall technique used for the interview (Gass & Mackey, 2000) included an elicited introspective verbal report with the participants to gather what people thought about their request choice in each role play prompt. The interview questions were basically open questions to let participants talk freely and also to provide their “insights into their decision making rationales” (Schauer, 2009, p. 77). The interview includes questions about a possible tactful request, the most significant contextual factor and a suitable tone of voice for each context (see Appendix G for both the Persian original and translation). In the first question, the researcher also prepared a couple of common Persian request strategies as alternatives to suggest to participants for their consideration. For example,
- *khahesh mikonam/khaheshan/lotfan...*
  Please...

- *ejaze hast...?*
  May I...?

- *mikhestam bebinam age emkanesh vojod dare/emkanesh hast/maghdore...*
  I wondered if it would be at all possible...

- *mishe ye lotfi konin...?*
  Would it be possible to do a favour...?

- *mitooni lotfan...?*
  Could/can you please...?

Because it was a group interview, not individual, the questions were open as starting prompts. The individuals were not interviewed about *adab* (Persian politeness) or politeness judgments directly. Open questions could provide the opportunity for interviewees to share their similar real-life experiences if there were any. A group interview also has the advantage that individuals might confirm, complete or disagree with their interlocutor.

To stimulate the recall, each pair watched their videos, mainly the turn in which speakers made their initial requests as well as nearby turns. The video was then paused to query the speakers and the addressees. Also, the researcher with each pair scanned each role play video quickly to catch any interesting part that might have had an influence. If so, the pair was asked about their reasons or ideas on that part as well. The open questions also allowed them to decide what they wanted to talk about unlimitedly with limited interruption by the researcher.

Schauer (2009), who proposed the semi-structured interview technique, asked her study group later general questions to “obtain a better understanding of participants’ perceptions of linguistic/pragmatic features” (p. 78). During the interviews, the participants asked for clarity on questions. They usually just talked about their experiences, observations, their partner, and how they defined their relationships. However, in some cases, some initial answers were brief or direct, and then they were asked follow-up questions if appropriate to learn more of their thought process. For example, in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, when one of the
speakers was discussing how he did not use a certain type of request strategy with his professor, the researcher asked him ‘Why did you think you should not have used such strategies in this context or what was the problem with them?’

Some participants were also eager to know if their ideas were interesting to the researcher or helped the study. The researcher did her best to be neutral and did not confirm or reject what the participants shared or explained on their request choices in the interviews. Instead, she listened to them carefully and used back channelling signals or words such as nodding her head or saying words, like ahan, are, khob, jaleb-e, dorost-e ‘right, aha, yes, good, interesting, okay’ as recommended by Bolton and Bronkhorst (1996). This expressed hearing without confirming or rejecting their ideas. She also even asked for clarification when a few discussions were unclear about the participants’ message and double checked for her understanding of what they expressed or meant. Schauer (2009, p. 82) suggested “clarifying questions” be used to “control the flow” without expressing the researcher’s idea on discussions. It can happen that people leave their speech incomplete as they think their addressee understands what they mean in context; sometimes it is true but for the purpose of the research, transcription and careful analysis, it was important to recheck what they said with themselves while recording.

The language used across the whole sessions was Persian and never switched to English. However, one of the challenges was that the researcher had a different dialect from other participants and had to speak standard Persian during the description process as well as the interviews and not to use colloquium or expressions which were not familiar to them. People did not code-switch to English often at all. A few words did appear, such as the words “scenario”, “project”, “okay” which are quite familiar in academic settings in Iran. No one ever switched to a full sentence of English.

3.4.3 Self-Esteem Questionnaire

In the present study, the instrument to measure self-esteem was the original Rosenberg (1965) self-esteem questionnaire developed in English (see Appendix J). It includes 10 statements where each item is scored by a four-point scale format ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree.’ Its translation into Persian by Ganji (1384/2005)7 with slight modification

7 This reference was published in Iran using the Iranian calendar. The researcher has mapped the Iranian calendar year to the Gregorian calendar year.
was used (see Appendix I). One of the modifications was to translate ‘a number of’ in the third item (see Table 3.3) from ‘some’ to ‘many’ in Persian. The other modification into Ganji’s work was deleting the Persian translation of ‘usually’ in the item “All in all, I am inclined to feel I am a failure.” as the original English item does not contain ‘usually’. Both the original questions and the translations were provided for participants. They were required to select one choice for each item and were asked to complete the questionnaire within a few minutes in order to forestall them from changing their answers. Table 3.3 shows the original Rosenberg (1965) self-esteem questionnaire items. Volunteers could not be pre-selected by self-esteem unless they participated so it was not possible to ensure a large range of self-esteem scores, a risk of the study design.

Table 3.3

Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane/basis with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach’s alpha (Cronbach’s α) was calculated for the current study and it was highly reliable with a 0.85 score.

It might be interesting to see how the data collection instruments are linked to each other in this study. Although role plays and interviews can be done without each other, they are linked in that the study aims at an emic perspective on actual requests, and the role plays are those requests. The interviews are about the role plays and therefore require them. Also, they are about the participants’ own behaviour, which is different than watching a TV show or natural data of someone else.

Through looking at different analytic aspects of request behaviour, speech act analysis is more researcher-oriented, more comparative, and more standardised; interactional analysis looks at the conversational context, how each person’s speech fits into the whole task; interviews focus on drawing out an emic perspective. The Rosenberg (1965) scoring goes across all three codings, because they can re-use that in each analysis. None of the analyses, speech act, interactional, and interviews, require the other and good research can be done with each by itself. However, they each reveal aspects that the other could miss. Also, they can reinforce each other (see section 7.2.1).

### 3.5 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

This study received ethical approval from the University of Otago to proceed (see Appendix A). At the outset, each volunteer pair arrived at an office. After being welcomed, they received a brief explanation of what they would be asked to do; they then read the information sheet (see Appendix B) and signed the informed consent form (see Appendix C). Volunteers were matched by schedule availability. The speaker and the addressee in each pair could know each
other already or could be new to each other. Therefore, there was no selection criteria for grouping the participants other than being a Persian male postgraduate and not knowing about the request topics.

Each single pair was told that they would act out four open role play request scenarios in Persian academic contexts, answer some interview questions about their performance on each request interaction one by one, answer the 10-item self-esteem questionnaire and provide background information. On average, it took less than five minutes to talk about the entire process of their participation and also to answer the participants’ questions if they had any.

Each individual as the speaker was seated in front of the addressee with a short distance. A camera was aimed towards the speaker and another towards the addressee. Both camera positions were to cover partly the other interlocutor from one side. However, when some participants were performing role plays, they moved and were out of the other camera’s covering area. An audio recorder was also used to record all conversations plus stimulated recall interviews. In addition, to get familiar with the process of open role plays, the participants were asked to do two thanking role plays as training. Each of them played the speaker’s and the addressee’s role in the trainings so as to know about types of cards and where to stand. The picture of the session is shown in Figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1. Actual role play scenario session.](image-url)
The interlocutors selected their first scenario card randomly and the following cards were placed in order (not shuffled) and the researcher then gave the next card to them one by one after each role play completed. A single speaker in the pair was always the one requesting with the other being requested for all four prompts. That role did not alternate. The reason for not swapping the roles is that the study requires the same speaker with the same self-esteem to make all the requests. Also, none of the participants knew what the request scenario cards’ text would be and who would be the requestee or the requester beforehand, so as to produce quasi-natural conversations. Each pair was also asked not to talk about the prompts when they met other prospective Iranian volunteers as the population of Iranians in the community is fairly small. The addressee’s request cards did not include any information about what the speaker is going to request. The volunteers participated in the study only one time and played only one role. The participants took their time to read their selected cards. They then started their conversation with their partner.

The researcher reminded the participants to imagine they are doing these role plays in Iran, not in New Zealand, and also advised them about their standing and sitting positions in each prompt before their act was started. Because of the Persian culture and hierarchical system which influence people’s positions in different social contexts, in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario and the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario with power differences and office-based, the speakers were told to stand when they started their conversation but they were then free to act while the natural conversation was going on. The location of the second prompt, the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario, was in a class and the interlocutors both were asked to stand. In the third prompt, the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, the participants were in a college and they acted it out while seated. Sitting or standing positions should not influence the participants’ self-esteem. As discussed in section 2.5.1, self-esteem is a stable feature of adults’ personality which does not vary from time to time. Body postures might affect people’s confidence and then their speaking behaviour, but not their esteem easily. Table 3.4 shows each standing/sitting position in each situation.
Table 3.4

Standing and Sitting Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor-Extension (+P+D)</td>
<td>Stand</td>
<td>Sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)</td>
<td>Stand</td>
<td>Stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D)</td>
<td>Sit</td>
<td>Sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D)</td>
<td>Stand</td>
<td>Sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the role plays lasted 8-15 minutes in total. However, there were four role plays which took more than 20 minutes. After the role plays finished, each pair was asked to watch the recorded role play videos. There was no interval between the role plays and the interview. The participants’ answers differed in length. Most of the individuals explained their reasons, and spoke about their decision and real-life experiences extensively and freely, while some of them discussed the questions briefly. The audio-recorded interview lasted between 20 to 50 minutes except for one of the interviews which was longer than an hour, “in keeping with their individual differences regarding their willingness to share their views and experiences” (Schauer, 2009, p. 83).

As the addressees did not have a chance to make requests in the role plays, instead they were asked to speculate about what they would have done if they had been in the role of speakers. In the interviews, all participants were further asked about a possible tactful request, the most significant contextual factor, and a suitable tone of voice for each context. They answered all four questions, but in one case, a speaker did not know how to answer two of the questions for the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario as he had never been exposed to this situation.

At the end, individuals were asked to answer the self-esteem questionnaire. On average, it took less than two minutes to tick the 10 items. The questionnaire results were collected in the
same session as all role play scenarios were done. The whole procedure took less than an hour for each session, with the one exception already mentioned.

In total, the video-recorded role play conversations and the audio-recorded interviews both were over 16 hours in length. All of them were transcribed and translated by the researcher. All transcriptions were also coded by the researcher first and then double checked with a Persian native speaking linguistics PhD candidate. Literal translations were used since it did not interfere with understanding the meaning in order to provide a sense for the Persian structures for non-Persian readers. The data coding and analyses are discussed in details in the subsequent chapters separately.

As Haugh (2010, p. 156) discussed, “the role of the interviewer needs to be taken firmly into account in any analysis of interviews.” Although the researcher did not take part in any role plays, she was present (she stood in the corner of the office) in all sessions to explain the process of participation, run the camera, answer the participants’ questions if they had any, interview the participants and collect the self-esteem questionnaire.

No personal information that could identify participants were included in the results from this study. Pseudonyms were used for every participant to protect their identities. No other person other than the researcher and the supervisors had access to the participants’ video conversations and any references to individuals within articles use pseudonyms. Most importantly, their self-esteem results were coded by numbers.

3.6 SUMMARY

In order to explore sociocultural and psychological variations dealing with the range of request strategies, controlled yet quasi-normal speech data were collected through the open role play method along with interviews and a self-esteem questionnaire. Role play scenarios varied across the two dimensions of power and distance, while it was hoped that participants’ self-esteem would vary naturally. In other words, people at different levels would participate, generating a range of high and low self-esteem. Speech act, conversation-based and interview-based analysis, are discussed in the following three chapters, one chapter for each type of analysis.
CHAPTER 4
REQUESTS AS SPEECH ACTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will present speech act analysis procedure including data coding and then describe the findings. To find the answer to the first research question, which asks whether and how social power, distance and self-esteem predictors affect people’s request choices in different contexts, the data were quantitatively analysed. Chapter 5 will analyse the role plays as an interactional accomplishment, and Chapter 6 includes a qualitative analysis of interviews. The current chapter restricts itself to a classic speech act approach to requests.

4.2 REQUEST DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Data consisted of the transcribed request role plays in the four different educational settings from 18 pairs (36 individuals) of Persian native speakers, a total of 72 role play conversations that was 5 hours in length. The role play data were transcribed with the participants’ complete conversations including repetitions. The entire role play transcription process took over 32 hours. Transcription was done solely for the purposes of analysis using Trosborg’s (1995) speech act coding. Therefore, transcriptions included the words spoken with additional marks for hesitations (typically with filler words), pauses (shown with {pause}) and incomplete speech (an ellipsis …), as hesitations are one form of internal supportive moves. No further transcription schema was employed. Transcription attempted to match exactly what was said as far as Persian orthography allowed without regularization to a more standard variety. The transcriptions of all role play conversations in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario is found in Appendix F.
4.2.1 Coding Data

Request classification systems by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) and Trosborg (1995) have been devised for the analysis of request strategies. In this study, the data were coded based on the framework by Trosborg (1995) with some modifications to cover the entire data in Persian. In this model, the request utterances, the so-called head acts, can be classified into three major groups: direct requests, conventionally indirect requests and indirect hints. The model has also introduced detailed internal and external supportive moves which come before, within or after request head acts across different languages. Her request schema is given with examples for English (along with the explanations) from Trosborg (1995, pp. 192-205) and for Persian from the collected data in the following sections 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.1.3. The applicability of internal and external modifications has been successfully tested on previous Persian request studies (Saberi, 2012; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011).

The unit of analysis is the sequence of utterances the speakers made in the request role play exchanges. Thus, each sequence is analysed into the following procedure: (1) external supportive moves; (2) head acts along with internal supportive moves; (3) external supportive moves. The primary modification to the Trosborg coding system was to extend the internal and external supportive moves coding. In Trosborg’s scheme, some items are only listed as internal moves, while the current data found them occurring both internally and externally. The same was true of some external moves, which were only external in Trosborg, but could be external or internal in the current data. Table 4.1 shows how the sequence coding procedure worked with an example for each prompt.

In order to ensure the reliability of the modified request classification scheme, all coding of the data were re-checked by the researcher with three-week and then three-month intervals. The intra-rater reliability was found at 92% and 98% agreement respectively. All differences were then discussed with the supervisor and were eventually resolved and an agreement was reached on all coding categories.

One example of a request that needed recoding was the realization of the requestive term *mishe*? ‘[Would it be] possible?’ which was difficult to classify in three cases because it could correspond to other different equivalents such as *mitooni*? ‘Can you?’ or *ejaze hast*? ‘May I?’ in Persian (see also Saberi, 2012). For example, the strategy *hala mishe kopi [begiram]*? literally means ‘Well, [would it be] possible to photocopy?’ included *mishe*? ‘Possible?’ that had first been coded as possibility strategy, but the pragmatic meaning here references the
permission and the strategy ‘Well, allowed to photocopy [them]?’ was then re-categorised into the ‘permission’ category, conventionally indirect.

Another case is that although the verb ‘need’ was used in a few request choices, they were first considered as a ‘Desire/Need’ speaker-oriented request strategy. In this context, the speaker talked about his problem and then suggested how to sort it out, which was by providing him a grant to complete his project. Also, his request was not for a personal loan to be made by the departmental administrator, and more importantly the departmental manager evaluated his request as seeking advice in the role play. Then it was re-categorised into the ‘strong hints’ group.

mmm man baray-e karay-e darsim makhsoosan ke betoonam be moghe tamoom konam o ye seri karay-e azmayeshgahio dastana, niyaz be ye komak hazine pajooheshi daram. Umm to complete my projects, also my lab stuff, etc. especially on time, I need a research grant.

The further example on re-coding the ‘possibility’ to the ‘permission’ group was made in the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario. In the below request, no permission term, such as permit was not found, the meaning was, however, about asking for a permission in a question form.

vali ye kopi beram man begiram hamin chapkhone-ye daneshgah beram ye kopi az jozvehatono dashte basham baray-e in dars?
But, [do you let me go] I go to get a photocopy of your class notes from the unipress for this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1</th>
<th>Persian Request Sequence Coding Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td>External supportive moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor-Extension (+P+D)</td>
<td>bebakshid man mozahemeton shodam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am sorry that I disturbed you.</td>
<td>I wondered if it’d be possible, I submit my project with a delay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>External supportive moves</th>
<th>Head acts (can come with internal supportive moves)</th>
<th>External supportive moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classmates-</td>
<td>vali kheli</td>
<td>vali kholase mikhastam bebinam</td>
<td>kheyli agha ‘ESM’ goftan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing Notes (−P+D)</td>
<td>tarifetoon</td>
<td>mitoonam ye rozio moavan konim</td>
<td>ke jozvahetetoon kamel-e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shenidim.</td>
<td>man jozavato ye kopi dashte basham ta</td>
<td>Mr ‘FIRST NAME’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alan in ye maho?</td>
<td>highly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your class notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends-</td>
<td>kheyli nemikham</td>
<td>albate kheyli shayad dorost naborse</td>
<td>dir o zood dare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing Money (−P−D)</td>
<td>vaghteto begiram</td>
<td>vali mikhastam begam ke mishe in</td>
<td>Sokhtoo soz nadare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maho man ye meghdar azat gharz</td>
<td>Man belakhare in polo hala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>begiram pool-e khargaho bedam ke be</td>
<td>ve hafe...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mahz-e inke pool-e mano rikhtan…chon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ina dirkard daran.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe it’s not proper, but I wanted to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>say would it be possible that I borrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some money from you this month, then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>once they process my</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>payment…because they are late.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-</td>
<td>hala gozashte az</td>
<td>are, bad poroje ham poroje kheyli</td>
<td>vali khob ma talash-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking an Application (+P−D)</td>
<td>ona be moshkela-</td>
<td>khoobi-ye! Doost daram ke ye jaei</td>
<td>khodemoono mikonim va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e mali khorde</td>
<td>beresoornamesh be khoobi tamoom</td>
<td>ghatan be ye jaei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poroje.</td>
<td>beshe.</td>
<td>miresoonim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After all, the project has faced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>financial difficulties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes anyway, the project is also very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interesting. I’d like to work on it so that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it’ll be finished well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But well, we give a try</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and make it in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>certainly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.1 Request head acts

To code core head acts, the researcher focused on the turns which contain the requestive verb and were responded to by the addressee as if the turn was a request. In the first example provided below, the speaker’s asking is clear in his move by a form of ability strategy which was included the requestive verb *gharz begiram* ‘Can I borrow?’ and his addressee, in this case a classmate, responded his request positively in the immediate turn.

*Gooyande:* mikhastam bebinam mitooni masalan [meghdari pool] gharz begiram azat? Be mahz-e inke omad, ye 2-3 hafte badesh variz konam?
*Speaker:* I wondered can you, for example [some money], I borrow from you? Once it’s paid, I return it within 2-3 next weeks.

*Mokhatab:* na, moshekeli nist.
*Addressee:* No, it’s not a problem.

In the second example, the speaker’s turn was coded as the request head act because his interlocutor, in this case a professor, understood his request in that turn and responded with a question in the immediate turn as shown below (see Appendix F, pair 1, turn 13 for full context).

*Gooyanda:* mmm fekr mikonam payan termam ro khoob neveshte basham. Monteha, hanoz forsat nakardam ke kamel eee poroje ro tahvil amade bokonam va tahvil-e shoma bedam.
*Speaker:* Umm I think I did well in the final exam, but I haven’t found any chance to complete err the project and submit it to you.

*Mokhatab:* ta key mikhayn shoma tahvil bedin?
*Addressee:* Until when do you want to submit [it]?

Based on Trosborg’s (1995) coding schema, the linguistic realization of the request head act can take the form of any of the thirteen possible strategies introduced in English. An additional request category ‘possibility’ as a conventionally indirect strategy, mostly speaker-oriented, was created to accommodate the strategies found in the data. This form was already proposed in Félix-Brasdefer’s (2012) study as one of the strategies which is inherently included in the query preparatory category of Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) classification. Tables 4.2.a, 4.2.b, and 4.2.c contain request strategies with examples for English (along with the
explanations) from Trosborg (1995, p. 192-205) and for Persian from the current data. However, because some of the Trosborg (1995) codes were not exemplified in the data, the examples for the rest of the possible request strategies were provided by the researcher, noted by an asterisk.

Table 4.2.a

*Trosborg’s (1995) Head Act Request Coding Schema (The Request is Underlined)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Request Strategies</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a) Obligation             | You must/have to lend me your car.  
*shomaa bayad ghabl az morakhasi ye etela kochik bedin.*  
*‘You have to give a short notice before your leave.’* |
| b) Performatives          | I would like to ask you to lend me your car.  
mikhastam azat khahesh konam bara man pardakht koni.  
‘I wanted to ask you to pay this for me.’ |
| Hedged                    | *az shomaa darkhast daram in nama ro emza konid.*  
*‘I request you to sign this letter.’* |
| Unhedged                  | I ask/require you to lend me your car.  
*az shomaa darkhast daram in nama ro emza konid.*  
*‘I request you to sign this letter.’* |
| c) Imperatives            | Lend me your car.  
*jozehato chand saat behem ghazr bede.*  
*‘Lend me your class notes for a few hours.’* |
| Elliptical phrases        | Your car (please).  
pas age zahmat nist, in jazaveh ro?  
‘So if it’d not be a trouble, these class notes [please]’* |
Table 4.2.b

*Trosborg’s (1995) Head Act Request Coding Schema (The Request is Underlined)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventionally Indirect Request Strategies</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Hearer-oriented conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ability</td>
<td>Could you lend me your car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Willingness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possibility (created in this thesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suggestory formulae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Speaker-oriented conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wishes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wishes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Desires/needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### a) Hearer-oriented conditions

1. Ability

- Ability
- Willingness
- Permission
- Possibility (created in this thesis)

2. Suggestory formulae

### b) Speaker-oriented conditions

1. Wishes

2. Desires/needs

---

*a) Hearer-oriented conditions*

1. Ability

- Ability

- Willingness

- Permission

- Possibility (created in this thesis)

2. Suggestory formulae

### b) Speaker-oriented conditions

1. Wishes

2. Desires/needs
Table 4.2.c

*Trosborg’s (1995) Head Act Request Coding Schema (The Request is Underlined)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Request Hints</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Mild hints
  The request is made in a way to signal some points to the object to get the listener to do it. | I have to be at the airport in half an hour. My car has broken down. *man bayad pool-e inaro ham beheshon bedam baray-e shahriye. Bad alan gir kardam mondam chikar konam?* ‘I must pay accommodation charges. Now I’m stuck what to do next?’ |
| 2) Strong hints
  The request contains no hints directly to the request, but conveys the message by a given context. | Will you be using your car tonight? *man vagheiyatesh mikhastam eee age to dasto balet hast. Man chon alan borsiyeha ro narikhtan.* ‘The truth is that I wondered err if you have any money because the scholarship hasn’t been processed yet.’ |

The modification to the framework was to add ‘possibility’ as a separate conventionally indirect strategy found in the present data. It was the most frequent request choice in Persian (see sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3). The possibility category found in this study has also been discussed in two other Persian studies by Saberi (2012) and Salmani Nodoushan and Allami (2011, pp. 211) differently. In line with Félix-Brasdefer (2012), Salmani Nodoushan and Allami (2011) placed the ‘possibility’ request forms in the category of ‘query preparatory’ proposed by Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) classification as a conventionally indirect request strategy. The following example is provided from Salmani Nodoushan and Allami’s (2011, p. 211) study on request: “*mishe jozvahaato chand saaэat be man эamaanat bedi?* ‘Could you lend me your class notes for a few hours?’”

It is important to distinguish between ability and possibility when classifying conventionally indirect requests. Saberi (2012, p. 223) argues that *mishe* and *mitooni/momken-e/ejaze hast/eshkali nadare?* ‘Can you?/[Would it be] possible?/May I?/Don’t you mind?’ function as equivalents. His example is “*mishe ye khaheshi azatun bokonam* (‘Is it possible that I make a request from you?’), which corresponds to ‘may I ask you a favour?’, or ‘would you mind doing me a favour?’ in English” (p. 223). There are many pragmatic cases where this is true. However, there are differences as well. Phrases such as *[man]* *mitoonam?* ‘Can I?’ or *[to]* *mitooni?* ‘Can you?’ come with the first or second person pronoun. *Mishe*, however, does not refer to the possibility of a person but to a situation. The meaning is more ‘Is it possible?’ not
“are you possible?” Requests started with mishe? ‘Possible?’ or age mishe ‘if possible’ also focus more on an object or a condition rather than a person. Therefore, this study coded the following phrases age mishe/age emkan dare/age maghdor-e/age momken-e ‘if possible/if it would be possible/if there is possibility’ into the ‘possibility’ category.

It should be noted that in the Trosborg request schema, the category ‘conventionally indirect strategy’ is divided into hearer- and speaker-oriented conditions in English while the speaker-oriented condition in Persian seems slightly different in the use of form. For instance, the initial ability request head acts in the data, as a speaker-oriented condition, were made with first person pronoun ‘man/I’ in a possibility or a question form. So speaker-oriented requests are not used with the singular or plural second person pronoun to/shoma ‘you’. Persian speakers may wish not to question addressees’ power or ability as they seem more polite and safe in Persian. Below is an example of the ability strategies used in the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario which shows a portion of the Persian culture:

mitoonam azatoon gharz begiram ye kopi azashoon begiram jozveha ro?
Can I borrow the class notes from you to photocopy them?

4.2.1.2 Internal supportive moves
Request head acts are sometimes accompanied by internal modifications within the head acts to soften or intensify the seriousness of the request act (Færch & Kasper, 1989; House & Kasper, 1981; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011).

Modality markers are linguistic devices with the goal of modifying the coerciveness of requests internally (House & Kasper, 1981). If they mitigate the impact of a request, they are called ‘downgraders’. Otherwise, they are ‘upgraders’ that increase the force of a request (Trosborg, 1995). Lexical and syntactic are two types of internal modifications by which a speaker can reduce the threat of a request (Færch & Kasper, 1989; House & Kasper, 1981). The primary purpose of syntactic downgraders is to build towards a polite impression even from turns that are not part of the focal position’s head act (Trosborg, 1995). It further helps the requester not to lose face if the addressee fails to do the request, as well as lets the requestee have more options if the request is not met. Table 4.3 shows the examples of syntactic mitigators as well as lexical downgraders (Trosborg, 1995, pp. 209-15). The table
provides English examples from Trosborg and Persian examples made in the data except where noted by an asterisk.

Table 4.3

*Trosborg’s (1995) Internal Supportive Moves (The Move is Underlined)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal supportive moves</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(a) Syntactic downgraders:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Can/will you do the cooking tonight?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>khastam bebinam mitoonam azat polo gharz begiram baray-e masalan hodode yek mah intora va zood behet bargardonam?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I wondered can I borrow this money from you for about a month and return it soon?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couldn’t you hand me the paper, please?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mikhastam ke age beshe faghat yek hafte dige be ma forsat bedin ke man betoonam poroje ro tamom konam.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I wondered if it’s possible to give me only one more week to finish the project.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answer the phone, won’t you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>baham tamas begir emrooz, tamas migiri?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>‘Ring me today, won’t you?’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to borrow some of your records if you don’t mind lending me them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mikhastam ke age beshe faghat yek hafte dige be ma forsat bedin ke man betoonam poroje ro tamom konam.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I wondered if it’s possible to give me only one more week to finish the project.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I wonder if you would be able to give me a hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mikhastam ke age beshe faghat yek hafte dige be ma forsat bedin ke man betoonam poroje ro tamom konam.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal supportive moves</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘I wondered if it’d be possible to give me only one more week to finish the project.’</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Appreciative</td>
<td>I’d be so grateful if you’d give me a hand. <em>age beshe ke kheili kheyli ghadrdaneton misham.</em> ‘If it’s feasible, I’d be so grateful to you.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Subjective</td>
<td>I’m afraid you’ll have to leave now. <em>mazerat mikham vali shoma bayad ta in tarikh madarek ro befrestin.</em> ‘I’m afraid but you have to send your documents by this date.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ing-form</td>
<td>I was wondering if you would give me a hand. <em>This form does not exist in Persian.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modals</td>
<td>Mightn’t I come with you? <em>momken nist pool behem toolanitar gharz bedi?</em> ‘Mightn’t you lend me the money for longer?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Lexical/phrasal downgraders</td>
<td>Hand me the paper, please. <em>goftam ke azat bepersam vali kharesh mikonam ke to ba man taarof nakon.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness marker</td>
<td><em>I wanted to ask you but please, don’t do taarof (without formality) with me.</em> (used as an external move)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used to express politeness</td>
<td>Maybe you wouldn’t mind helping me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative device</td>
<td>‘Would it be possible to sort it out? Do you think it’d be possible to fix it?’ (used as an external move)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping the speaker to learn the listener’s satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal supportive moves</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtoner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the power of the request by using them</td>
<td><em>mikhastam ke age beshe faghat yek hafte dige be ma fresh bedin ke man beeloomam projoa ro tamom konam.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as, simply, perhaps and possibly</td>
<td>‘I wondered if it’s possible to give me only one more week to finish this project.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understatement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a more desirable request by using them like</td>
<td><em>vali eee faghat nikham ke be man ve zare zaman bedin age mishe lotfan?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘a minute’</td>
<td>‘But err I just want you to give me a little more time, if possible, please?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the kind of adverbials bringing indecision and</td>
<td><em>mishe shoma ve jorai behem komak konin babate zaman tahvil-e poroje?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letting the listener herself/himself determines it</td>
<td><em>‘Would it be possible that you sort of help me out to extend the project’s deadline?’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hesitator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalling the politeness, which conveys the</td>
<td><em>vali eee faghat nikham ke be man ye zarre zaman bedin age mishe lotfan?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apprehension of the requester to solicit his/her</td>
<td>‘But err I just want you to give me a little more time, if possible, please?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal marker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the interpersonal relationship and</td>
<td><em>ta chaharshanbe bad az zohr betoonam baraton email bekonam age eshkal nadashte: bashe?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfying the hearer</td>
<td>‘I can email it to you on Wednesday afternoon if it is okay. Okay?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(c) Upgraders</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial intensifier</td>
<td>You really must come and see me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>shoma vaghean mitonin behem komak konin.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Internal supportive moves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘You could really help me out.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do-construction</th>
<th>Oh, really, do come and see us, we’d be so pleased.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*kheyli dost darim bebinimet, hatman biyakhonamoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘We’d love to see you, do come over to our house.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment upgrader</th>
<th>I’m absolutely positive that you’ll lend me your car.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*man 100% motmaenam ke darkhastam rad nemikonin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I am 100% percent sure you won’t reject my favour.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical intensification</th>
<th>You’d be such a darling if you helped me just this once.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*shoma kheyli ba mohabatin age in nama ro emroz befrestin vasam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘You’d be so kind if you send me this letter today.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studies on Persian employed different frameworks for their data coding. For example, Modarresi Tehrani and Tajali (1391/2012)\(^8\) used Alcón-Soler et al.’s (2005) request modifications for their interlanguage Persian data. The Alcón-Soler et al. typology of internal and external modifications is based on other pervasive request classifications such as Sifianou (1999) and Trosborg (1995) to fit interlanguage studies. One of the main differences in Alcón-Soler et al.’s (2005) modifications classification and Trosborg’s (1995) is that ‘please’ has been considered as an external supportive move in Alcón-Soler et al.’s (2005) coding schema, but this modifier is introduced as an internal one in Trosborg’s. In addition, Martínez-Flor (2009) discussed that ‘please’ belongs to external supportive moves which supports Alcón-Soler et al.’s (2005) framework for request modifiers, which may depend on how ‘please’ as a

---

\(^8\) This reference was published in Iran using the Iranian calendar. The researcher has mapped the Iranian calendar year to the Gregorian calendar year.
politeness marker is perceived and used by native speakers in different languages. However, *khahesh mikonam/lotfan* ‘please’ in Persian is often embedded in request head acts and in this case, Trosborg’s (1995) request schema fits this current study better, too. Also, as discussed in 2.4.2, Saberi (2012) discussed that politeness markers like ‘please’ in Persian help the bare infinitive/direct request to become a milder polite request.

### 4.2.1.3 External supportive moves

External modifications come before or after the request head act and affect how the addressee interprets the head act (Trosborg, 1995). They are usually longer than internal ones and affixed to the head act (Aijmer, 1996). They are also less formulaic than internal modifiers (Færch & Kasper, 1989). There are reasons, preparators, and disarmers strategies to use as external modifications (Félix-Brasdefer, 2005). Again, Trosborg’s coding was used (Trosborg, 1995, pp. 216-18, Table 4.4.)
Table 4.4

*Trosborg’s (1995) External Supportive Moves (The Move is Underlined)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External supportive moves</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the content</td>
<td>If one wants to borrow a dress for a party one can start talking about this part. <em>man ye meghdar moshkel dashtam avaele term.</em> ‘I had a bit of a problem early this semester.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening the conversation in a way that the request be in perfect harmony with the setting</td>
<td>I need your help. <em>midooni ke sob ta shab balaye sar-e poroje hastim dige. Eee fekr konam in poroje ye kam chiz mikhada.</em> ‘You know that we are working on this project from morning till night. Err I think this project needs something.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the speech act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking on availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting a pre-commitment</td>
<td>Would you mind doing me a favour? <em>ghablanam khodet gofte boobdi.</em> ‘You, yourself, already told me.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disarmers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the requestee’s manner smooth and receiving his/her compliance</td>
<td>I hope I’m not disturbing you but… <em>bebakhshid man mozahemeton shodam, sharmande.</em> ‘Sorry that I disturbed you. I’m sorry.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweeteners</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet-talk and praising of the addressee is a way to get him/her to do the requested act.</td>
<td>Your collection of books is very interesting. <em>harf-e shoma baray-e ma sanad-e.</em> ‘We trust in your word.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive reasons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The listener is more likely convinced to do the request if she/he sees the requester’s explanation.</td>
<td>Could you take in the washing, please? It looks as if it’s about to rain. <em>ye 4-5 jalase-ei ro natonestam tooy-e kelas ha biyam.</em> ‘I couldn’t attend 4 to 5 sessions of the class.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost minimizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking about the details of the request to diminish any possible expenses to the addressee may receive positive feedback.</td>
<td>Would you mind driving to the airport to pick up Mary? I’ll pay for the petrol. <em>be mahzi ke borsiyeha oomad, behet midam [polo].</em> ‘I’ll return [the money] once the scholarship is paid.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Trosborg coding system provides us with a categorization of request internal supportive moves which come within head acts and external supportive moves which come before or after the head act. However, in this study, there are a couple of times that internal modifications were made externally such as hesitators, and an external modification, cost minimizing, was used internally. Thus, a modified version of the Trosborg coding scheme of request head acts was used in this study.

4.2.1.4 Self-esteem grading

Regarding the self-esteem items, participants who ticked self-esteem items 1, 3, 4, 7 and 10 ‘Strongly Agree’ were given three points, ‘Agree’ two points, ‘Disagree’ one point and ‘Strongly Disagree’ zero points. These assigned values were then added up. It should be pointed out that asterisked items (i.e., 2, 5, 6, 8 & 9) are reverse scored. (Note that the printed questionnaire sheet for the respondents were without the asterisks.) The maximum total score is 30 and the lowest is 0.

To categorise the resulting data points, those above the median score\(^9\) were taken as having high self-esteem and those below it were taken as having low self-esteem. Appendix K shows the list of items with the scale of grading individuals’ self-esteem. This study used the median score to divide the participants into two groups, high and low self-esteem. Table 4.5 shows that the results of self-esteem were almost from mid to high due to the limited number of postgraduate participants. The high self-esteem score was 29 and the lowest score was 12 for speakers, and the median score was 22. The score above the median score was 22 and the one below it was 20. The high self-esteem speakers group includes 10 Persian men and the low self-esteem speakers group includes 8 Persian men. For addressees, the highest and the lowest

---

\(^9\) There is no standard way to categorise scores on the Rosenberg scale. As the current research is concerned with relative differences between participants, a simple median dividing line based upon collected data was employed.
scores of self-esteem were 29 and 14, respectively. The median score for this group is 22.5. The score above the median score was 23 and the one below it was 22. So there is only one-unit gap between high and low self-esteem groups for addressees. The high and low self-esteem addressees groups include 9 Persian men in each.

Table 4.5

Results of Self-Esteem Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Addressees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Score</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Score</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Group</td>
<td>N=8 (≤ 21)</td>
<td>N=9 (≤ 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Group</td>
<td>N=10 (≥ 23)</td>
<td>N=9 (≥ 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

This chapter focuses on the first research question: ‘How do social distance, sociocultural power, and self-esteem influence request behaviour in Persian? Quantitative models test for relationships between the three independent variables–power, distance and self-esteem–on counts of the coded speech acts and other numerical measures from the role plays. This includes counts of head acts (direct, conventionally indirect, and indirect hints), internal supportive moves, and external supportive moves. Furthermore, to show the extent of wordiness used across the four prompts, the total number of words, total number of turns, and total number of request strategies were calculated for each prompt.

It was inappropriate to model each dependent measure in the same way due to their frequency and general distribution. Each measure was visualised to determine whether any transformations were necessary and what sort of regression–linear or logistic–best fits the data. By looking at the density plot of each variable, the suitable regression analysis was chosen. For example, the analysis run for the numbers of total words, turns, request strategies and external supportive moves was linear regression with log transformation. For these variables, there were a large range of values. Figure 4.1 shows the histogram of total words made by 18 speakers.
The p-values are calculated using Satterthwaite’s approximation as implemented in lmerTest package (Kuznetsova, Brockhoff & Christensen, 2017).

For linear models, a log transform was only used when it made the data more closely approximate a normal distribution. For the purpose of comparing the frequency of different request head act strategies in different contexts, percentages of the particular head act over all head acts were calculated, rather than raw or log-transformed data. Internal supportive moves occur, by definition, within head acts so that the number of head acts directly affects the number of internal moves possible. Therefore, internal moves were turned into a ratio of internal moves per head act.

Figure 4.1. Histogram of total words used in each dialogue.

For some items, the resulting data were more categorical than continuous. All different types of request strategies such as direct and conventionally indirect, and external moves such as preparators, etc. were not made frequently or not repeated. For such variables, categories such as ‘yes and no’ category or ‘once and more’ category were created. Figure 4.2 shows the histograms of direct request strategies and preparators as an external modification. The former was turned into a category of occurring or not occurring. The latter was categorised into ‘once and more’ groups as only one participant made no preparators in a situation.
For syntactic downgraders as one of the categories of internal modifications, there are two sorts of analyses that may be of interest. One is to treat it just like the external moves above, creating a category which is syntactic downgraders divided by head acts. This will give an average number of syntactic downgraders per head act. This is necessary as if people make more head acts, then they have a chance to make more syntactic downgraders. However, this solution does not distinguish between two situations: in situation one, they have three head acts and make three syntactic downgraders on one and no syntactic downgraders on the other two. In situation two, they have three head acts and make one syntactic downgrader for each act. Therefore, to look at that, a categorical analysis was performed (Figure 4.3). In one test, the independent variable was zero downgraders or one downgrader. In a second test, the independent variable was one downgrader or more downgraders.

**Figure 4.2.** Histograms of direct strategies and preparators used in each dialogue.

**Figure 4.3.** Histogram of syntactic downgraders used in each dialogue.
For all data, raw, transformed, or categorised, a mixed effect regression analysis by Rstudio was performed (Baayen, Davidson & Bates, 2008; Faraway 2006). Main effects included power, distance and self-esteem. Random effects were by individual. The data were too sparse for further random effect structure. To choose a model, different models created from simple to complex fixed effects (i.e., power, distance and self-esteem) were created. The first model included only one predictor; then the next model included each two predictors. Lastly, all predictors as well as the interaction of every two predictors or all three together were included. The simplest model where all fixed effects were significant was chosen. Models were also directly compared with ANOVA and the Akaike Information Criterion.

4.4 FINDINGS

In the four different requestive academic contexts that crossed social power and distance, 18 Persian-speaking participants produced 16,296 total words, 3,655 turns, and 865 total request strategies of which 148 were head acts, 226 were internal modifications and 491 were external modifications. On average, each speaker\(^{10}\) made 226 total words, 50 turns, and roughly 12 total request strategies, including 2 head acts, 3 internal modifications and 7 external supportive moves in each scenario (Figure 4.4). Therefore, each dialogue averaged more than one request head act, and the number of external supportive moves used exceeded internal modifications.

\[\text{Figure 4.4. Mean of all request head acts, internal and external modifications per person per scenario.}\]

\(^{10}\) Note that speaker in this context means the one making the request only.
4.4.1 Total Number of Words, Turns and Request Strategies

The best model for the Total Number of Words includes the log of the number of words as dependent variable and power and distance as independent variables with no interaction. Statistical analysis showed that social power and distance significantly correlate with total number of words. Persian speakers produced a greater number of words both where there are power differences (Estimate = 0.35, t = 5.25, p < 0.001) and where there are distance differences (Estimate = -0.13, t = -2.05, p = 0.04). The self-esteem predictor was not statistically significant.

The best model for the Total Number of Turns includes the log of the number of turns as dependent variable and power and distance as independent variables with no interaction. Power and distance are significant but not self-esteem. Iranians made a greater number of turns both where there are power differences between interlocutors (Estimate = 0.15, t = 2.5, p = 0.01) and where there are no social distances (Estimate = -0.27, t = -4.47, p < 0.001).

With regard to the Total Number of Request Strategies (i.e., head acts, internal and external supportive moves), the best model includes the log of the number of request strategies as dependent variable and power as independent variable. Power had a significant effect. The requesters employed a greater number of request strategies where one interlocutor has more power than the other (Estimate = 0.22, t = 3, p = 0.004).

4.4.2 All Head Acts

The frequency of all request head acts in all settings as well as each prompt is presented in Table 4.6. Of the 148 different request formulas produced, 99 (67%) of all requests included the use of a conventionally indirect request, 30 (20%) included the use of an indirect requestive hint and only 19 (13%) included the use of a direct request strategy. Therefore, the most frequent head act request category in all contexts is conventionally indirect where the possibility strategy is the most frequent choice, 61 (41%). In each prompt, the most frequent head act request category is also conventionally indirect, and the possibility strategy is the most used choice.
Table 4.6

*Frequency of All Head Acts (incl. 1st Head Act) across All and Each Scenario(s)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Conventionally indirect</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>possibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor-Extension (+P+D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The best model for All Head Acts includes the log of the number of all head acts as dependent variable and power and self-esteem as independent variables with no interaction. Statistical analysis showed that in the number of all head acts, power is significant and self-esteem neared significance. Thus, the Iranians made a greater number of head acts where there are different powers ($Estimate$ = -1.24, $Wald’s Z$ = -2.4, and $p$ = 0.02), and also the high self-esteem group made a greater number of head acts than the low self-esteem group ($Estimate$ = 0.93, $Wald’s Z$ = 1.81, and $p$ = 0.07).

The above models tested the relation of power, distance, and self-esteem to the count of all requests (head acts). One can test their effect on each type of request forms as well. None of the predictors had a significant effect on the number of direct and conventionally indirect request choices. However, the best model for Total Indirect Requests includes the log of the total number of indirect requests as dependent variable and distance and power as independent variables with no interaction. Social distance is significant for the total number of indirect request forms and power neared significance. Persians used a greater number of indirect request strategies where the interlocutors have a distant relationship ($Estimate$ = -1.98, $Wald’s Z$ = -3.0, and $p$ = 0.003) and where one interlocutor has more power than the other ($Estimate$ = -
1.13, *Wald’s Z* = 1.9, and *p* = 0.06). Table 4.7 shows request examples made in each scenario by one of the speakers.

Table 4.7  
Request Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Multiple requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Professor-Extension (+P+D)**  | 1. *mmm fekr mikonom payan termam ro khoob neveshte basham, monteza*  
                                   | *hanooz forsatz nakardam ke kamel ee poroje ro amade bokonom va tahvil-e*  
                                   | *shoma bedam.*  
                                   | Umm I think I did well in the final exam, but I haven’t found any chance to  
                                   | complete err the project and submit it to you.                                |
|                                 | 2. *mikhastam ke age beshe faghat yek hafta dige be ma forsatz bedin ke man*  
                                   | *betoonam poroje ro tamom konam.*                                              |
|                                 | I wondered if it’s possible to give me only one more week to finish the project. |
| **Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)** | 1. *vali kholase mikhastam bebinam mitoonam ye roozio moayyan konim man*  
                                   | *jozavato ye kopi dashte basham ta alan in ye maho?*                          |
|                                 | But anyway, I wondered can we arrange a time for me to photocopy your class  
                                   | notes that took a month for you to make it?                                   |
|                                 | 2. *hamoon rooz man betoonam beram ye photocopy sar-e chaharrah Pasdaran*  
                                   | *anjam bedam sari khedmatetoon miyaram.*                                       |
|                                 | The same day if I can photocopy your class notes at Pasdaran intersection, I’ll  
                                   | return it to you immediately.                                                 |
| **Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D)** | 1. *mikhastam bebinam age moshkeli nist bibinam chetori-ye vazeyat.*           |
|                                 | I wondered if there is no problem to see how your financial status is.        |
|                                 | 2. *ye 300 400 tomans mikhastam bebinam mitoonam masalan, gharz begiram azat?* |
|                                 | *Be mahz-e inke omad ye 2-3 hafta badesh variz konam.*                         |
|                                 | I wondered can you, for example 300,000 or 400,000 Tomans, I borrow? Once  
                                   | it’s paid, I return it within 2-3 weeks.                                       |
| **Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D)** | 1. *mikhastam bebinim alan chetoriye sharayet-e grant o ina?*                |
|                                 | I wondered what is the condition of research grant?                          |
|                                 | 2. *mishe fekr kard rooy-e mah-e ayande? Granti mitoonin baram peyda konin?*  |
|                                 | Would it be possible to expect a research grant next month? Can you find a grant  
                                   | for me?                                                                        |
4.4.3 1st Head Acts

In data collected from a DCT, there is only one request head act provided by the participant. However, in semi-natural role play, a participant might make a request multiple times within one conversation, with a request either repeating or evolving through the conversation. This fact allows the examination of patterns related to the 1st head act in the conversation vs all head acts (just analysed above). The frequency of 1st head act request strategies produced in all contexts and each prompt are shown in Table 4.8. Of the total 72 different first head acts produced by the participants, 45 (62.5%) included the use of a conventionally indirect request, 22 (30.5%) included the use of indirect hints and only 5 (7%) included the use of direct strategies. The most frequent 1st head act request category including all contexts is conventionally indirect of which the possibility form is the most frequent one 35 (49%).

In each prompt, the most used 1st head act of 18 strategies is conventionally indirect of which the possibility form is the most frequent 1st head act used in the three situations: 61% in Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, 50% in Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario, and 44% in Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, while in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario where there is closeness, 39% mild indirect hints were frequently made for the initial requests (Table 4.8).

Table 4.8

Frequency of 1st Head Act Request Strategies across All and Each Scenario(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Conventionally indirect</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor-Extension (+P+D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some 1st head act examples made in the different situations are provided in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9

*Examples of 1st Head Act Requests in Four Scenarios*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Professor-Extension (+P+D)**   | 1. mikhastam bebinam age momken-e ba ye takhiri man khedmateton taghdim konam.  
                                   | ‘I wondered if it’d be possible to submit it with a delay.’               |
|                                  | 2. mikham bebinam age lof konid ye mohlat-e dige bedin tamdid konin.     |
|                                  | ‘I wonder if you could do a favour [and/that] give an extension.’        |
| **Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)** | 1. mikhastam bebinam age emkanesh hast bara to ke jozvehato ro azat begiram ye modati?  
                                           | ‘I wondered if it’d be possible for you that I can borrow your class notes for a while.’ |
|                                  | 2. man mikhastam jozveha ro azat begiram baray-e kopi kardan.           |
|                                  | ‘I wanted to get your class notes for photocopying.’                     |
|                                  | 3. mitoni behem gharz bedi jozvehato?                                   |
|                                  | ‘Can you lend me your class notes?’                                      |
### Scenarios

**Friends-Borrowing Money (P−D)**

1. *mikhastam azat beporsam ke aya age barat momken-e, age barat maghdoore, emkanesh ast ke mablaghi moadel-e ejare yek maho be man gharz bedi?*
   
   ‘I wanted to ask you if it’d be possible at all for you, is it possible to lend me some money, equivalent to one-month’s accommodation charges?’

2. *khastam bebinam mitoonam azat polo gharz begiram baray-e masalan hodode yek mah intora va zood behet bargardonam?*
   
   ‘I wondered can I borrow some money from you about a month and return it very soon?’

3. *mikhastam bebinam age moshkeli nist bibinam chetori-ye vazeiyat, chon alan eee…*
   
   ‘I wondered if there is no problem to see how your financial status is. Because now err…’

**Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D)**

1. *mikhastam bebinam ke aya emkanesh hast ke man betoonam ye eghdam bokonam betoonam ye borsi chizi begiram baray-e inke beresam be karam?*
   
   ‘I wondered would it be possible that I can get a grant or something to complete my work?’

2. *doost daram ke ye jaei beresoonamesh be khoobi tamoom beshe.*
   
   ‘I’d like to complete it very well.’

3. *mikhastam bebinam department hemayati mikone?*
   
   ‘I wondered, does the department support?’

4. *in komak hazine pajoheshi ma ke gharar bood ke bara ma berizin hanooz nayoomade.*
   
   ‘The fund which was supposed to be paid for me hasn’t come yet.’

In the above examples, the 1st head acts were often accompanied by embedding some internal supportive moves such as tentative forms and conditional clauses.

#### 4.4.4 Internal Supportive Moves

Of the 226 different internal modification formulas used in all prompts, 182 (80%) included the use of syntactic downgraders, 38 (17%) included the use of lexical downgraders and only 6 (3%) included the use of cost minimizing strategies and disarmers, as external modifications in
Trosborg’s coding used internally. As discussed in section 4.2.1.3, cost minimizing and disarmer external modifications were occasionally used internally, within the head act. The most frequent internal supportive moves category in the four prompts is syntactic downgraders of which conditional clauses are the most used strategy 26% (Table 4.10).

Syntactic downgraders are also the most frequent internal supportive move of which conditional clauses are the most used choice in the three contexts: 35% in Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, 27% in Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario, and 29% in Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, while in the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, 21% of past tense strategy was used most frequently. With regard to the number of different types of internal supportive moves, none of the predictors had significant effect on the number of lexical and syntactic downgraders in different contexts. Therefore, knowing Power, Distance, and Self-Esteem would not help predict which internal moves would occur.

Table 4.10

*Frequency of Internal Supportive Moves across All and Each Scenario(s)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Syntactic</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
<th>Cost minimizing</th>
<th>Disarmer</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor-Extension (+P+D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Checking an Application</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.4.5 External Supportive Moves

Of the 491 different external modification formulas produced across all situations, 168 (34%) included the use of preparators, 100 (20%) included the use of supportive reasons, 80 (16%) included the use of lexical downgraders, an internal modification used externally (see section 4.2.1.3), 11% included the use of cost minimizing, 8% included the use of sweeteners, 6% included the use of disarmer, 4% included the use of promise of a reward and only 1% included the use of syntactic downgraders, an internal modification used externally (see section 4.2.1.2). The most frequent external supportive move in all contexts is preparators of which preparing the content as a sub-category strategy is the most frequent choice 24%. Preparing the content is also the most frequent choice in the three scenarios, 26% in Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D), 33% in Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, and 22% in Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, whereas 29% supportive reasons was the most frequent in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario.

The best model for the Number of External Supportive Moves includes the log of the number of external supportive moves as dependent variable and power and distance as independent variables with interaction (Estimate= 0.52, t= 3.11, p= 0.003). The relationship can be seen in Figure 4.5. The highest number of external supportive moves occurred in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. Overall, the number of external supportive moves is about the same in both +Distance and −Distance situations, while the number of moves increased for the +Power situations.

\[\text{Figure 4.5. The relationship of power & distance for external supportive moves.}\]
The above model tested the relation of power, distance, and self-esteem to the count of all external supportive moves. Each type of external supportive modification categories can be tested as well. The best model for the Number of Preparators Strategies includes the log of the number of preparators as dependent variable and distance as independent variable. Only social distance significantly correlates with the number of preparators strategies. In the contexts with familiarity (i.e. Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) & Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenarios), the Persians used a greater number of preparators strategies (Estimate = -0.5, t = -1.96, p = 0.05; Table 4.11), although there is a different level of closeness in those contexts, which will be discussed in Chapter 6.

The best model for the Number of Disarmers Strategies includes the log of the number of disarmers as dependent variable and power as independent variable. Only social power significantly correlates with the number of disarmers strategies. A greater number of disarmers strategies was used in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) and the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenarios where there are power differences between interlocutors (Estimate = 2.04, Wald’s Z = 3.4, p < 0.001).

The best model for the Number of Sweeteners Strategies includes the log of the number of sweeteners strategies as dependent variable and power and distance as independent variables with interaction (Estimate = -3.2, Wald’s Z = -2.7, p = 0.005). The relationship can be seen in Figure 4.6. The highest number of sweeteners strategies occurred in the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario, whereas the least used in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario (Table 4.11). Overall, the number of sweeteners strategies is about the same in both +Power and −Power situations, while the number of moves increased for the +Distance situations.
Figure 4.6. The relationship of power and distance for sweeteners strategies.

The best model for the Number of Supportive Reasons Strategies includes the log of the number of supportive reasons strategies as dependent variable and power as independent variable. Only social power significantly correlates with the number of supportive reasons. Therefore, a greater number of supportive reasons was used where the addressee was of higher power than the speaker (Estimate= 3.555, Wald’s Z= 3.33, p< 0.001).

The best model for the Number of Cost Minimizing Strategies includes the log of the number of cost minimizing strategies as dependent variable and power and distance as independent variables with interaction (Estimate= 4.14, Wald’s Z= 2.34, p= 0.02). The relationship can be seen in Figure 4.7. The highest number of cost minimizing strategies occurred in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario. Overall, the number of sweeteners strategies is close in both +Power and +Distance situations, while the number of moves increased for the –Power and –Distance situations.
The best model for the Number of Promise of a Reward Strategies includes the log of the number of promise of a reward strategies as dependent variable and power as independent variable. Only social power significantly correlates with the number of promise of a reward strategies. A greater number of this choice was used when the addressee has more power than the speaker \( (\text{Estimate}= 1.57, \text{Wald’s } Z= 2.24, p= 0.02) \).

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Preparator</th>
<th>Disarme</th>
<th>Sweetene</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Promis</th>
<th>Lexica</th>
<th>Syntacti</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor-Extension</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+P+D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7. The relationship of power and distance for cost minimizing strategies.
### Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preparer</th>
<th>Disarm</th>
<th>Sweeten</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Promise</th>
<th>Lexical</th>
<th>Syntactic</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classmates - Borrowing Notes</strong> (−P+D)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>content 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends - Borrowing Money</strong> (−P−D)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>content 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager - Checking an Application</strong> (+P−D)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>content 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5 HIGH AND LOW SELF-ESTEEM GROUPS

This study used the median self-esteem score to divide the participants into two groups, high and low. The high self-esteem group includes 10 speakers and 9 addressees. The low self-esteem group includes 8 speakers and 9 addressees. Figure 4.8 shows that 2.25 is the mean number of different request formulas as head acts used by the high self-esteem speakers in the role plays, 1.5 is the mean of the use of conventionally indirect requests, 0.5 is the mean of indirect request hints and 0.25 is the mean of direct request strategies. 1.8 is the mean of number of different head act request formulas used by the low self-esteem speakers, 1.25 is the mean of conventionally indirect requests, 0.3 is the same mean for direct requests and indirect hints. The possibility strategy was frequently selected by both high and low self-esteem speakers in the different contexts (mean: 0.6 & mean: 1.1, respectively).
As discussed in section 4.4.2, the best model for All Head Acts includes the log of the number of all head acts as dependent variable and power and self-esteem as independent variables with no interaction. For all head acts, power is significant and self-esteem neared statistical significance. The high self-esteem group (Estimate = 0.93, Wald’s Z = 1.81, p = 0.07) used a greater number of head acts than the low self-esteem group. This dependent variable is the only head act variable where self-esteem neared significance. The same strategy (i.e., possibility) was frequently selected by both high and low self-esteem speakers for their initial request in the different situations (mean: 0.3 & mean: 0.7, respectively).

Figure 4.9 presents that 3.4 is the mean of number of different internal supportive moves used by the high self-esteem speakers, 2.75 is the mean of number of syntactic downgraders, 0.6 is the mean of number of lexical downgraders, 0.05 is the mean of number of disarmer strategies, an external modification, used internally, and 0.02 is the mean of number of cost minimizing strategy, an external modification, used internally by this group.

This Figure also shows that 2.8 is the mean of number of different internal modification formulas used by the low self-esteem speakers, 2.25 is the mean of number of syntactic downgraders, 0.5 is the mean of number of lexical downgraders, 0.06 is the mean of number of cost minimizing strategies, an external modification, used internally, and 0.03 is the mean of number of disarmer move, an external modification, used internally. The conditional strategy from syntactic downgraders was the most frequent internal move that were used by both self-
esteem groups almost equally (mean: 0.8 & mean: 0.84, respectively). Internal supportive moves were also tested. Self-esteem was not significantly predictive of any of the variables.

Figure 4.9. Means of internal supportive moves by both self-esteem groups.

The mean of number of different external modification formulas produced by Iranians with high self-esteem across all contexts is 7, the mean of number of preparators strategies is 2.5, the mean of number of supportive reasons is 1.4, the mean of number of lexical downgraders, an internal modification, used externally is 1, the mean of number of cost minimizing is 0.7, the mean of number of sweeteners strategies is 0.6, the mean number of both disarmers and promises of a reward is 0.3, and the mean of number of syntactic downgraders, an internal modification, used externally is 0.02.

The mean of number of different external modification formulas produced by Iranians with low self-esteem across all contexts is 6.6, 2.12 is the mean of number of preparators strategies, 1.4 is the mean of number of supportive reasons, 1.1 is the mean of number of lexical downgraders, an internal modification, used externally, 0.7 is the mean of number of cost minimizing strategies, 0.5 is the same mean of number of sweeteners strategies and disarmers strategies, 0.25 is the mean of number of promise of a reward strategies, and 0.1 is the mean of number of syntactic downgrader, an internal modification, used externally (see Figure 4.10).
External supportive moves were also tested. Self-esteem was not significantly predictive of any of the variables.

Figure 4.10. Means of external supportive moves by self-esteem groups.

4.6 THE POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES USING INTERVIEWS

As mentioned in the Methods chapter, after people finished their role plays, speakers were asked if there could be an alternative request head act in those situations. Also, the addressees were asked to imagine themselves in the speaker’s position as a requester and to make their requests. Because the speakers made their tactful request choices in the role plays, a few of them had no better alternative. Table 4.12 shows that of the 72 request role plays, participants suggested 58 conventionally indirect strategies, 8 indirect hints, and 6 direct strategies. The conventionally indirect choice is the most frequent category among the addressees, which supports the statistical result of the possibility form chosen by the speakers (see sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3). Also, direct strategies has the last place in the interview which is the same as what the speakers employed in the role plays.
### Table 4.12

*Addressees’ Choices in Interview in Four Scenarios*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressees</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Conventionally indirect</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Possibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor-Extension (+P+D)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Possibility 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Possibility 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Possibility 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Possibility 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Possibility 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7 SUMMARY

This chapter asked if the social variables of power and distance, plus the personal variable of self-esteem, correlated with the types and counts of head acts and supportive moves made, as well as the total number of words and turns in the conversations. The results of total number of words and turns have shown that Persian speakers used more words and more turns when their addressee was of a higher power status, and also when the addressee was intimate. When the addressee was of a higher power status and also unfamiliar to the speaker, more external supportive moves were used. When the addressee was intimate, more preparators strategies, a type of external supportive moves, were used. And more supportive reasons, a type of external supportive moves, was used when the addressee was of higher power than the speaker.

With regard to the number of total request strategies and all head acts, when the addressee was of a higher power status, more request strategies and head acts were used. As self-esteem
neared significance on the number of all head acts, the high self-esteem group used more request head acts; self-esteem was non-significant in all other testing.

The number and the type of request choices and the length of request interactions in this study look different from some of the Persian studies using different methods (e.g., Eslamirasekh, 1993; Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011). However, the quantitative results indicated that Persian prefers using external supportive moves than internal supportive moves, which confirms the findings by Saberi (2012) and Salmani Nodoushan and Allami (2011).

Possibility as a conventionally indirect strategy was the most frequent first request formula used in Persian. However, mild indirect hints were frequently made for the initial requests when the addressee was intimate. Direct request formulas were the least frequent first head act request choices.

The interview results of addressees’ choices in the different prompts also support conventionally indirect as the frequent tactful request form in Persian. Indeed, this strategy had not been introduced as a head act request strategy in CCSARP by Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) and Trosborg’s (1995) request coding schemas. However, it was already proposed in Félix-Brasdefer’s (2012) study as one of the strategies which is inherently included in the query preparatory category of Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) classification. It was also found in Saberi’s (2012) thesis on Persian politeness.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

Quantitative speech act analysis, as exemplified in Chapter 4, has several limitations. These include: (a) the quantitative analysis picks up the presence or absence of request acts and the supporting moves, but misses larger structures; (b) the results are dependent upon the coding scheme so that any item which does not fit the coding scheme is missed; (c) as the coding simply counts single turns (request acts and the supporting moves), there is no developed analysis of how the entire conversational interaction works. This chapter analyses how common Persian request dialogues took place in which the request is seen as a conversational task, rather than a single turn, to look at the interactional level of the request-response sequences. The chapter also aims to identify what was involved in conversations and how speakers negotiated topics in Persian contexts. This interactional approach focuses upon the second research question ‘How do Persians accomplish a request dialogue as a joint activity?’

This chapter first introduces the type of conversation-based analysis performed, including the transcribing procedure and how conversations were examined. In Chapter 4, focus was on speaker choices across all scenarios, identifying differences across Power and Distance variables. In this chapter, the interaction between speaker and addressee is examined in detail, focusing on one scenario, the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. One scenario should identify key patterns in this new analysis and examining further scenarios is left for later research. This implies that the current chapter cannot directly address questions of Power and Distance, though features identified here can be incorporated with findings of other analyses to inform understanding (see Chapter 7). The main body of the chapter presents the findings by topic. A summary then identifies the main findings.
5.2 INTERACTIONAL DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

As discussed in section 2.3.1.4, the starting point for the type of analysis of this chapter is Clark’s (1996) approach to conversation as a joint activity. In each request conversation, the participants were given the task of asking for an extension. When given such a task, what do participants do?

As Clark (1996) discusses, “Although people talk in order to get things done, they don’t know in advance what they will actually do” because “they cannot know in advance what the other will do” (p. 319), especially in unscripted conversations. Similarly, in the request role plays, the speakers often set up the request not knowing in advance what exactly it would be, other than it would be a request for an extension. Full details of the conversation were not provided in the scenario cards; they had to experience what would happen next in the conversation in order to reach their goals. For example, most of the students initiated the request for more time without having an exact date in mind. When they were asked by the “professor” how much time they needed, they started to think of an invented date and negotiated along the way. As there were no pre-existing conventions between the novel partners, the participants struggled with ‘conventionalizing novel form-meaning pairings’ (Mills, 2014, p. 163) of what the request exactly is. Moreover, as the addressee had to respond novelly to the invented time (or other conversational choice), small decisions early in the conversation, such as choosing “tomorrow” for the extension time, could steer a conversation in a very different direction than another choice, such as “in two weeks”. The unique early history of the conversation could affect its destination and result (see also Mills, 2014).

Due to the dynamic, variable nature of the conversation, the interlocutors are fundamentally concerned with establishing what the other knows or should know related to the request task. This requires monitoring what is common ground and what is not. After a turn such as ‘How long was assigned for the project at the time of request?’ or ‘When was the deadline?’, participants must make a relevant contribution (Grice, 1975) to continue the cooperative task. The interlocutors make contributions that are relevant, and the addressees usually find them to be pertinent to the discussion, making it possible to be coordinated in their joint task. The goal of the current interaction-analytic approach is to discover what the recurring conversational accomplishments were. This can be done by searching for the sorts of items that are grounded. By and large, speakers knew when their conversation was ending, which implies that they knew when their request task had been accomplished.
The process of generating theory from data based on the role play transcripts began with coding what participants accomplished in each turn. The analysis then developed by identifying segments of related topics. At the first level of coding, words or phrases that are relevant to the aims of the study were identified. The second level of coding identified the boundaries of a sequence of turns related to a single activity, by using changes in topic, pauses and fillers. Excerpt 5.1 shows the analysis of one of the sequences of a role play conversation. The turns all were about greeting which could be grouped together.

Excerpt 5.1

01 A: befarmaeid.
   Come in please.

02 S: salam.
   Hello.

03 A: salam aleykum.
   Hello.

04 S: hal-e shoma khoob-e?
   How are you?

05 A: ghorban-e shoma.
   Thank you.

06 S: khoob hastin?
   Are you good?

07 A: mersi
   Thanks.

At the lower level of coding, the turns that were about greeting were coded into the greeting part. At the higher level of coding, they refer to the larger phase, opening the request conversation. These more general phases were implicit in the initially identified segments and were deductively categorised.

This process was repeated through the course of each conversation across all pairs and then compared across pairs. Several activities repeated across conversation, such that when they had been accomplished, the interlocutors decided that a request task had been completed and moved into the closing part of the conversation. These accomplishments can be taken as an approximation of what speakers believe a request conversation is composed of.
Identifying what occurs in Persian request conversations required a close analysis. Only one situation would fit within the time and space constraints of this thesis research. The Professor-Extension scenario was selected to allow the focus to be on participant differences instead of the social variables, Power and Distance, which have already been examined in Chapter 4. In the Professor-Extension scenario, power and distance have a relatively uniform effect across all performances of the scenario. However, as self-esteem was participant-based, it did vary within the one situation and is studied here. Excerpts are provided as part of the text, and all transcriptions of role plays along with translations are presented in Appendix F.

5.3 FINDINGS

Six main activities of a request conversation–as exemplified in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario–were identified. The list does not discuss ‘making the request’ as a separate activity because it was the topic of Chapter 4.

(1) Opening the request conversation
(2) Justifying the request
(3) Emphasizing joint goals
(4) Accepting the request
(5) Co-determining the request
(6) Closing the request conversation

These activities do not necessarily occur in discrete parts of the conversation and not necessarily in a sequence, with the exception of the opening and closing. Rather, activities 2-5 often overlap. For example, a justification for the request can be introduced early but returned to later. Also, one justification might be a joint goal. Together each of these smaller activities helps constitute the overall request activity which must be coordinated in terms of meaning and understanding.

5.3.1 Opening the Request Conversation

Generally to open conversations, the requester first greeted the requestee, introduced himself, and then approached his problem. At this point, the requestees, in this case professors, often
asked if there was already an appointment or checked the student’s name and the name of the course the student had with him. Greetings typically took 8 to 12 turns; only two pairs, pairs 12 and 14 (all people with low self-esteem), had long greetings (20 moves) in which the turns are repetitive and short. For example, in pair 7 (both speakers with low SE), the student opened the conversation with greetings, including apologizing for taking the professor’s time, and then the professor wanted to check the student’s name before talking about the problem (Excerpt 5.2).

Excerpt 5.2

01 S: *salam ostad.*
Hello professor.

02 H: *salam.*
Hello.

03 S: *haletoon khoob-e?*
How are you?

04 H: *mersi. Shoma khoobi?*
Thanks. How are you?

05 S: *bebakhshid mozahem shodam.*
Sorry I disturbed you.

06 H: *na kharesh mikonam. Befarmaeid.*
No problem. Come in please.

07 S: *salamatin? Hamoontor ke vaght gerefte boodam, mikhastam ye mozooei ro matrah konam bahatoon.*
Are you good [how are you?]? As I already made an appointment with you, I wanted to talk to you about an issue.

08 H: *shoma bebakhshid esmetoon?*
You excuse me, your name?

09 S: *man ‘ESM’ hastam.*
I am ‘FIRST NAME’.

10 H: *ahan. Khob khob?*
Alright. Well?
Pairs 9 and 10 (all speakers with low SE) claimed that they did not make an appointment when the professor asked them, even though the scenario cards says they did; all other speakers claimed they had.

### 5.3.2 Justifying the Request

After the opening, whether short or long, the topic ‘asking for more time for the submission deadline’ was introduced. This could be immediately after the greeting sequence or preceded by other preparations or reasons before making the beginning request. The frequent initial reasons are provided in Table 5.1.

#### Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial reason</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Type of Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. be khater-e feshar-e karay-e darsaye dige.</td>
<td>Due to pressure of studying other courses.</td>
<td>Other duties: school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. kami gereftar boodam va nashod jamesh konam.</td>
<td>I was a bit stuck and couldn’t finish it.</td>
<td>Not able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. chon sar-e kar miram va ye meghdaram az shahrestanam miyamo miram.</td>
<td>Because I go to work and come and go from another town.</td>
<td>Other duties: work and travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. bekhater-e ye seri moshkelat-e khondevadegi / bekhater-e ye seri masael-e shakhsi.</td>
<td>Due to family issues / due to personal issues</td>
<td>Other duties: family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. kheyli mohemm-e in nomre-ye payan term.</td>
<td>My final exam’s mark is really important.</td>
<td>Important consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. chon ke barnamam in-e ke darkhast bedam, bad mammolan moaddel kheyli tasir dare.</td>
<td>My plan is to apply [for jobs], GPA is generally very important.</td>
<td>Important consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial reason</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Type of Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ye kam karay-e pare vaght ham hastesh.</td>
<td>Due to a part-time job.</td>
<td>Other duties: work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. chon bayad shahriye ro bedim.</td>
<td>I would have to pay an [extra] tuition fee.</td>
<td>Important consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. in poroje kheyli sangin-e va vaghtgir.</td>
<td>The project is dense and time-demanding.</td>
<td>Not able</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. in vahedha ke bardashtam hamash takhassosi-ye, aslan nemishe ke chiz kard ke resond va poroje khoobi tahvil dad.</td>
<td>All the courses I’ve taken are required and I’m not able to turn in an impressive work.</td>
<td>Other duties: school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ye done az dastgah haye tooy-e azmayeshgah irad peyda karde.</td>
<td>One of the machines in the lab doesn’t work properly.</td>
<td>Not able</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see three primary types of reason: (1) The speaker has some other duties, such as other classes, work, or family; (2) They are not able to do the task due to either task difficulty or unavailable resources; (3) Not getting the extension would bring negative consequences. They affirm the importance of the work. Other duties, reason (1), make the student unable to complete the task, so (1) and (2) might be collapsed into one category. All together then, the student both affirms the importance of the task that the professor has given them and states that they have been unable to complete that task for some reason, the most common of which is a lack of time. With speech act theory, the reason for a request is not ignored: It is classified as an external supportive move whose effect is to alter the perception of the request’s politeness. In this interaction-analytic approach, however, the exact type of justification provided is identified and revealed to be important to the (un)success of the request.

For example, in pair 5 (both speakers with low SE; Excerpt 5.3) the student introduced the topic by mentioning the pressure of other courses and assigned projects, and the time limitation in the second semester. However, the professor did not accept the reasons and reframed the request to teach time management to the student. The student expressed his reason with long explanations which took 3 individual turns; however, the responses from the professor were brief, and the request for more time was not granted.
Excerpt 5.3

05 S: valla gharaz az mozahemat inke in term chon nim sal-e dovom hastesh, nim sal-e kootahi hastesh, man chand ta vahed-e dige ham darm ke hame asatid poroje dadan baray-e darso. Bad ba tavajoh be in zaman-e kootah vaghean maghdur nist ke betoonim. Inke nim sal-e dovom-e va hamintor ke khodetoon behtar midoonid kheyli nim sal-e kotahi hasto, term term-e shooloolghi hastesh man kheyli vahed gereftam haghiglatesh. Bad ye tooiri hastesh ke man term-e ghabl ham vazeiyat-e moaddelam khoob nabooode. Kheyli in term daram say mikonam moaddelamo mikesham bala o inha. Mikhistam bebinam age emkan dashte bashe ye komaki konid ke masalan baraye zaman-e poroje be tavajoooh be inke darsay-e dige asatid, hame poroje dadand kheyli tadakhol pish omade. Age betoonid ye rahkari ye chizi jolo pamoon bezarid ke ma betoonim in porojamoono era konid ke ma nomramoon taht-e tasir in amr gharar nagire, mamnoon misham.

The reason that I disturbed you is that because we are in the second semester and this semester is shorter than the first one, and I have a few more courses for which all professors have assigned projects, so we are not able to do the project due to this short period of time. You know better that this semester is shorter than the other one and is a busy semester; I’ve actually taken many courses. My GPA’s status in the last semester wasn’t high and I am trying to improve it this time. I wondered if it would be possible to help me in a way for example, for the time of submitting the project. Because there have been other courses, it is all a bit of a mess. If you can sort it out that we can finish our project. And it [the delay, the faulty] does not affect our mark, I’d be thankful.

06 H: khahesh mikonam. Montaha, hamontor ke midoonid, man entezar daram ke shoma poroje ro be moghe tahvil bedin va fekr mikonam agar ke…yani man entekhabo mizaram be ohde-ye khodetoon: ya poroje ro be moghe vase man miyarin va dar gheyre in soorat nomre ro az dast midin.

No problem. However, as you know, I expect you to submit your project at the due time, and I think if that…it means I’d leave you free to choose: either turn in the project at the due time or otherwise you will lose the mark.

07 S: ostad...
Professor...

08 H: entekhab ba khodetoon-e.

The choice is yours (it’s up to you).

09 S: ostad bahs-e inke shoma be tavajoooh be mabhas-e theory ke matrah shode to kelaso inha. Ona ro tonestem anjam bedam vali bahs-e in poroje o ina migam ba tavajoooh be in ke…hala migam in bahs ham gharar-e har farad ham be soorate enferadi in poroje haro erae kone inha, nemidoonam hala chetor mishe. Mmm shayad betoonam ye kar-e motavasseti ro jamo joor konam vali onjori ke mad-e nazaretoon bashe ghaedatan nemishe yani faghat serfe tahvil dadan bashe mishe ye chizo amade kard va tahvil dad.
Professor, it’s about the theoretical perspective discussed in the class. I could cover those, but I would say given that…this discussion [the project] is supposed to be presented individually, I don’t know how it will go. Umm perhaps I can wrap up a medium-quality project but it would not be like the one you would like to see but it can be ready just [to meet the deadline] for submission. But if you would like a significantly improved work, it certainly wouldn’t be possible with this given deadline.

The student stated that he did not have enough time; however, the professor did not believe that this was different than other students with the same issues. Granting this request would then undermine an educational purpose of the class and so was rejected. It is important to note that the scenario card provided none of this detailed information, nor did it specify if the request should be accepted or rejected. The fact that participants are providing this detail and making unique choices shows their engagement with the role play as a semi-natural interaction.

In pair 10 (both speakers with low SE; Excerpt 5.4), the student was also unsuccessful in convincing the professor. The first reasons given were the importance of work and improving his GPA. Because the student was asked about the reason again in the next move (turn 18), ‘family issues’ was stated. The student also added that ‘I am not an amateur at this course. My GPA is okay, too’ to indicate that ‘I’m a worthy student’ who deserves the extension. Questions and statements about the student’s work habits and studiousness are very common in the conversations which affected the professor’s decision on whether the student deserves it or not (turn 26, Excerpt 5.6; see also turn 17, Excerpt 5.13). The reason must be worthy as a poor reason can fail; one professor explicitly referred to the worthiness of the reason (excerpt 5.14; turn 10).

However, when a speaker either could not respond with an adequate response to the professor’s questions or could not provide convincing reasons for the professor, the request tended to be rejected. This professor reframed the request from an action of the professor, granting the request, to an action of the student, getting help from other friends, and so the student changed the request from an extension for himself to an extension for all students. When the student asked his favour repeatedly, the professor referred to the unfairness of the
nature of the request. Although the student promised a significantly improved work, the final decision was negative; 23 turns were exchanged for this negotiation. This negotiation proceeded sequentially through various justifications and suggestions, but circled back at the end to the family issue at the last line of the negotiation (turn 37).

Excerpt 5.4

15  S: eee rastesh mozahem shodam begam ke, valla ostad, {maks} man aslan dars-e shoma ro entekhab kardam chon midoonestam, tarife shoma ro shenide boodam hala be har tarighi vali
   Err actually, I disturbed you to talk to you that, Professor, {pause} I took this course with you because I knew, I heard a lot about you in different ways but

16  H: kahesh mikonam.
   Thank you.

17  S: motasefane be ye elali nemitoonam porojatoono tahvil bedam va bara manam kheyli mohemmm-e in nomre payan termo moaddelo dastano in harfa. Hala mihastam begam ke {mokhatab mipare vasat}
   Unfortunately, due to some reason, I can’t turn the project in [but] the final exam’s mark and my GPA are important to me. I just wanted to say {interrupted by the addressee}

18  H: che dalili? Dalilesh chi-ye?
   What’s the reason? What’s that reason?

19  S: valla ye meghdar moshkelat-e hala kheyli ham sahih nist begam vali moshkelat-e khanevadegi nashod. Bahane nemiyaram ostad.
   Actually, there were some private family issues which it’s not appropriate to talk about them here. I don’t bring an excuse, Professor.

20  H: khob?
   So?

   Generally, I am not an amateur at this course. My GPA is okay, too. I don’t want my GPA to get low. If it’d be possible, a bit more time.

22  H: khob, akhe che moshkeli boode shoma natoonestid porojatoono anjam bedin? Be har hal zami ke dadim bara poroje kafi boode. Hanoozam forsat darin mitoonin az doostanetoonam komak begirin.
Well, what’s been the problem that you couldn’t do your project? It was enough time for doing it. You still have time and can get help from your friends.

23 S: گفت: "درست می‌گویید. اما فقط یک مدت کمتر وقت می‌خواهم؟" 

You’re right. But err I just want you to give me a bit more time if possible, please?

24 H: "خوب حالیت عالی برای دیگران هم دارد، مشکلی دارند، کاری می‌دارند، کارهایی می‌دارند. همه ممکن است با مشکلاتی بپردازند. در ضمن هر کسی هر مشکلی داشته باشد." 

Well, there are other friends who have problems, have stuff to do and are busy with many things. Everyone has their own problem, anyway that

25 S: "هه" 

Err

26 H: "هنگامی که یونیورسیتی دانشجویم بودم همین اتفاقی رخ داده. باید بهتر عمل کنیم." 

would ignore their right as the time was same for all and the condition was same for all, too. I understand you and the same happened to me when I was a university student. There were problems and I got low scores then. But err if I knew your situation, I might be able to help you. [I would] suggest you to work with other students. But I can’t change (extend) the time for you.

27 S: "آستاذ، چی گفت؟" 

Professor, what you’re saying is right. There is a deadline and I have to finish the project.

28 H: "گفت: "من دسته‌برداری ویژه آن‌ها ندارم. یک بار دیگر گفتی که می‌توانم در این زمان بهتر عمل کنم."" 

You’re saying deadline. It means it’s over.

29 S: "گفت: "چی گفتی که من زمانی بهتر عمل کنم. من گوییم که من توانستم یک نتیجه بهتری از آن کسب کنم."" 

You’re right. But I wanted to say to give me a bit more time. I promise to make a significantly improved project.

30 H: "هه، گفت" 

Err, look if
S: ye meghdari
A bit

H: yek meghdari be shoma zaman bedam be digaran zaman nadam, in onvaght dar hagh-e oona zolm mishe.
Giving you a bit more time, and not giving it to the other students would ignore their right.

S: dorost-e ostad vali baghiye moshkel-e mano nadashtan ke. Man
Right but Professor, the other students did not have my problem. I

H: shoma nemidooni. Man nemidoonam.
You don’t know. I don’t know.

S: age dashtan ya hala har mozooei bood, ehtemalan miomadan matrah mikardan. Ehtemalan mitoonestan jamo jooresh konand.
If they had any, they would probably have come to talk about it. Likely they could sort it out.

H: shayad inghadr dargiran natoonestan biyan. Shayad inghadr moshkel daran ke vaght-e ino nakardan. Shoma moshkelet be che tartibe?
They might be pretty busy that they couldn’t find time. What’s your problem?

S: valla ye moshkel-e khonevadegi. Man kheyli nemitoonam, midoonin kheyli nemishe bazesh kard.
Actually, it’s a kind of family issue. I can’t very, you know, I can’t talk about it very much.

The justifications did not work for both pairs 5 and 10 (all speakers with low SE; Excerpts 5.3 and 5.4). The number of negotiation moves in pair 5 (Excerpt 5.3) was greatly less than in pair 10 (Excerpt 5.4). Another difference is that the student in pair 10 proposed a greater variety of reasons than pair 5, but both students’ main reason for the extension were similar: ‘Submitting a significantly improved project’ which did not satisfy the professors. Only one more student, speaker 8 (with low SE; Excerpt 5.12), who expressed that he had difficulty with the course as his first reason, claimed that he did not have any convincing reason for the extension when he was asked. This of course could reflect the fact that the speaker is in a role play and either did not think of a reason in time, as many others did, or did not feel comfortable inventing a reason.
Reasons for the extension were not always sequential, one reason then another, and so on, but were often mixed. This was particularly true for 9 of 10 speakers with high self-esteem and only 3 of 8 speakers with low self-esteem that mixed the reasons as shown in Table 5.2. Note that some of the pairs repeated their reason in the immediate next or close turns like pairs 1, 4, 18, while the others used it near the end of the conversation such as pairs 6, 7, 13, 10. For example, pairs 6 and 7 (all speakers with high SE) cycled back to the previous justification almost 20 turns later. Only in pair 3 (speaker with high SE, addressee with low SE) was the same reason used in both subsequent and far moves. Put together, this suggests that high self-esteem speakers would commonly return to an argument, while low self-esteem speakers only sporadically did (Table 5.2).

Table 5.2

Reason Mixed in the Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Reasons mixed (in subsequent, close or far moves)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HH</td>
<td>15. S: chon term-e 2 ham hast, sal-e dovomam hastim. Ye meghdar hajm-e kara...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because we are in the second [academic] semester, we are in the second year of the study. The amount of work...


S: You’re right, Professor. You say completely right. But because we’re in the second year of the study, there are also other papers to study. And we were under pressure a little to study other subjects, too, particularly there have been many final exams. I wondered if it’d be possible to give us a chance only one more week that I can finish this project.
Pairs Reasons mixed (in subsequent, close or far moves)


Thank you. I apologise, professor. I know I must turn in the project on time and you’ve noted earlier. But the thing is, because of a few personal issues and the work pressure, I can’t turn it in at the due time. I wanted to ask you if it is possible for you to extend the time a bit and turn it in to you a few days later.


You’re right. I totally understand and would never make such a request in a normal situation, but I faced some problems that led me make this request. Well, could you give me a piece of advice? I do my best to submit it at the due time. But if I can’t make it for 1%, is there anything specific that I can do in order to make up my mark?


By God, if I wanted to give you a mediocre work, I could have done it by the end of the week, but I have a plan to make it impressive and find a very interesting topic which is worthy to work on. Well, I’ll prove it to you Professor that it’s superb. Well, kindly do a favour.


That’s it. I found a good topic, I would like to work on it. Okay.
Pairs | Reasons mixed (in subsequent, close or far moves)
--- | ---
7 HH | 31. S: midoonam kheyli bayad be moghe boodo ino vali ye kam karay-e pare vaght ham hastesh. Bara hamin, kholase ye kami moraddad hastam... Nemidoonam.

I know I must be on time but I have a part-time job. For this reason, I am doubtful…I don’t know.

55. S: vali yekam in kar-e pare vaght ke man daram daneshgah.

But a bit my part-time job for which I work at the university.


You’re right but I’ve got a kind of family issue.

29. S: hamoon be har hal goftam ye seri moshkelat-e khonevadegi ast.

It is the same problem that I said, a kind of family issue.


I don’t want to take up too much of your time but err I disturbed you for the final project. Err it should have been finished by the deadline for which you’ve assigned a date. I err think, you surely know I am in the second year of my master’s program. The required courses are still to be taken in this semester. Err I can’t turn it in by the deadline unfortunately but can do it close to this date {pause}

Pairs Reasons mixed (in subsequent, close or far moves)

hamin ye kam...ye kam hamechi ghati shode bood. Man age betoonam, age beshe bishtar vaght gozasht ke, kheyli behtar-e.

As I said, I am in the fourth semester, in the second year. I am about to end [the degree]. There are a lot of projects to work on. I didn’t say this to make an excuse that other projects are more important than this. But there are 2 to 3 courses which are important and have to work on them as well. You teach here and are familiar with the process. The final exams all are usually close to each other with just 2 or 3 days’ distance. The ones that I would like to choose for my thesis topic are close to each other. A bit busy schedule. If I can, if it’d be possible to spend more time on them, it’d be much better.

3 HL 29. S: man rastesh chon sar-e kar miram, eee va khob midoonam shoma avval termam albate moshakhas goftin bayad poroj ha sar-e vaght tahvil dade beshe.

Because I actually go to work, err and I know very well [that] you emphasised that projects should be submitted at the due time at the beginning of the semester.

33. S: man mikhastam bebinam chon man sar-e kar miram, ye meghdaram az shahrestanam miyamo miram o ina, ayaaa emkanesh ast man ye hafie ba takhir betoonam porojam ro baraton ersal konam?

Because I go to work and have to come and go from another city, I wondered would it be possible [that] I can submit my project to you in a week with delay?

37. S: na man moteahel nistam. Vali be har hal majboram kar bekonam baraye...ke betoonam tahsil konam.

No, I am not married. But anyway I have to go to work for...to afford to continue my study.


Okay. I try my hardest. The truth is that the score 2.5 that I got for my mid-term exam was due to both commuting and not spending proper time on studying and so. I do compensate/work on it. I promise that I get a good score from you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Reasons mixed (in subsequent, close or far moves)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have taken this course with you in this semester. The project that I am going to turn in is a bit dense. I don’t think I can make it. Would it be possible to extend the time a bit? Because it will really take a while and I don’t really know what to do for that. |

Er because I have other classes, also this project is a bit dense for me. I mean the topic is a bit hard for me. Because of that I want more time to make it up (to complete it). |

Because I have to go to work, I have to do (leave the classes) sometimes. I can’t do [both]. |
| HL    | 15. SV: *valla hamoonjoor ke farmoodam, farmoodam che khabar {labkhand} bebakhshid ostad. Vali man be khater-e inke kar mikonam, ye khorde baze-ye zamanim mahdood-e. Hamoon kelas ham ke ehtemalan in sokhanan ro shoma farmoodid man natoonestam sar-e kelas basham.*  

As I said before, I said, what’s up? {smile} Excuse me, professor. Because I have to go to work, I have a bit of a time limitation. Probably I was not present at the class that you talked about such stuff, to speak with you about our problems. |
| 9 LL   | 17. SV: *ostad haghighatesh kheyli bara ma…moshkel peyda mikonim chon bayad shahriye ro bedim, karam mikonam. Age emkan dare, shoma ye tajdid e nazari befarmaein…mmm*  

Actually professor, it’s for us very…We face a problem because we would have to pay an [extra] tuition fee, I also work. If it’d be possible, you take into consideration again…umm |
21. S: dorost-e ostad. Term bad ham dobare hamin dastan-e ostad. Be har hal majbooram pare vaght kar konam. Mmm in porojam kheyli sangin-e. Man vahedhay-e ghablim ro...

That’s right, professor. I’d be in the same situation in the next semester. I have to work part-time. Umm this project is very dense. My last courses are…


Actually, there were some private family issues which it’s not appropriate to talk about them here. I don’t bring an excuse, professor.

37.S: valla ye moshkel-e khonevadegi. Man kheyli nemitoonam... Midoonin kheyli nemishe bazesh kard.

Actually, it’s a kind of family issue. I can’t very… You know, I can’t talk about it very much.


I wanted to say that the project is a bit dense. All the courses are sort of, the courses all I’ve taken in this semester are required. I can’t make it at all unless I turn in something like a mediocre work, that is…but we heard that err you expect a complete project. For that reason, I can’t meet the deadline. I want to finish it. If it would be possible, either extend the time or think the other thing.

29. S: na. Man chon dasrhave takhassosi in term ziyad dashtam. Yani nikham ke injoori chiz konam va masalan moaddelam...

No. Because I have many other courses in this semester. I wish to do something that does not [affect] my GPA.
The exact temporal structure of the justifications was highly influenced by the other partner and cannot be entirely predicted by the speaker when they plan their request. For example, in pair 10, the speaker provided his reason (a family problem; Excerpt 5.4) in turns 19 and 37, both times because the professor immediately asked for the reason in each previous turn. Therefore, one cannot easily state, “high self-esteem speakers have a strategy to return to their justifications.” The speaker returned because their addressee asked them to. Once something is grounded for the request, though, it can be utilised either in an adjacent turn or many turns later. The fact that the professor asks for a reason multiple times and the student acts as if this question is expected suggests that the reason for the request is not just a possible supportive move for making a request polite, but is part of what is expected in this sort of request. Part of knowing how to perform requests in Persian is knowing that a reason will be expected. This structure of requiring and often returning to reasons over different times within the conversation would not be captured by traditional speech act analysis as it does not look at the flow of a request discourse. The consequences of a lack of extension was one of the reasons that students provided. Excerpt 5.5 shows the student’s reason in pair 9 (both speakers with low SE) that if he failed the class, he would have to pay extra. However, the professor reframed the request to an alternative action: ‘Dropping the course.’

Excerpt 5.5

15 S: haghghatesh ostad, man biroon kar mikonam, ye khorde moshkel daram va eee fekr mikonam natoonam in poroje ro ta akhar-e term tahvil bedam. Mikhastam azaton ye khaheshi konam agar emkan dare…

The truth is that professor, I work, I also have a little problem and err I think I can’t finish the project by the end of semester. I wanted to request you if it would be possible…

16 A: valla shoma avayel-e termam ke be har hal biroon kar mikardino daneshjoo boodin dige. Yani be har hal midoonestin dige. Ma aavel-e kelas miyaym avayel-e jalase, avval-e avval migim: agha in tarikh-e tahvil-e poroje hasto. Nemidoonam be har hal. Nemidoonam ehtemalan nomrasho nemigirin dige.

Indeed, from the beginning of semester, you go to work and are a student, too. I mean anyway, you knew that you are a student. We told students from the beginning, in the first session of the classes: this is the deadline for the project. I don’t know anyway. I don’t know, probably you don’t get the mark.
S: اتاد هaghیghاد hکhayلی bارا م، موشکل میدار مکنیم چون بایاد شاهریه رو bدریم، کرام مکنام. اگه امکان داره، شوما یه تجدید-یه نظریه bبهفرمایین. ممّم

The truth is [that] professor, for us it’s very, we would face a problem because we would have to pay an [extra] tuition fee, I also work. If it would be possible, you take [it] into consideration again. Umm

A: چون توی-یه چی تجدید-یه نظر bبکونم؟ متوینین هافز-یه ازتراری، هانووک که نگذشته که.

What do I re-consider? You can [drop it] as an emergency case, its deadline hasn’t passed yet.

S: یک زمان-یه بیشتری.

A bit more time.

A: متوینین هافز bبکونین in دارسوس.

You can drop this course.

S: دوست-یه اتاد. ترم-یه بد حام دوبره هامین دستان-یه اتاد. به هر حال

That’s right, Professor. I’d be in the same situation in the next semester. I have to work part-time. Umm this project is very dense. My last courses are {interrupted by the addressee}

A: متوینین پروجیه ro سار-یه هامون مگه hala ye Zarre naghεs tar tahvil bedin ya mmm chon be har hal, la-aghal oontoori ye نمره-یه migirin. Vali bاد-یه vاغخت biyarین، dige man fekr nemikonam chon man aslan vagh t nemikonam tashih bokonam. Dige man hامون roozoo gozashtamo نمره-یه migirin farđash mikh rad bokonam bere dige, magar inke hala nesf-یه biyarین tahvil bedin. Manam نمره-یه hala bar asas-یه oonche tahvil dadin behetoon bedam.

You can submit your project with partial results at the due time or umm because anyway, at least you can get a mark for that part. But if you turn in it after the deadline, I don’t think so as I have no time to mark it. I assigned that day and will finalise the marks in the next day unless you turn in what you have done partially. I’ll give you the mark based on what you’ve submitted.

S: پاس میشیم اتاد؟

Would I pass it, Professor?

A: وَّالا dige oon dige...

Well, that is, that is…

S: {labkhand}
{Smile}

26 A: monde be in ke, hala emtahan-e payan term chetori bashe o baghiye kara o. Man ke shomaro ta hala sar-e kelas ke nadidam. Hala be har hal mesl-e inke kelas ham ke nemiyayn.
It depends on how you take your final exam and the result of your other [class] activities. I haven’t often seen you in the classes. It seems you don’t come to the classes.

27 S: na injooori ham nist ke nayaym ostad. Bazi jalasat ro boodim vali dige bazihasho majboor boodim ke bargardim sherkat kar ziyad boodo ina.
No, it’s not like that I don’t participate the classes. I attended some classes but I have had to miss some of the other classes to go back to work.

28 A: be har hal, bashe. hala shoma biarin bedino ma ham bebinim ke chikar chikar mitonim.
Anyway, okay. Turn it in and then let’s see what what we can do [for it].

It should be pointed out that when the request was accepted, there are some consequences and expectations that are generally determined by professors. They are often to reach the professor’s goal like yek pishraft-e ziadi dar yek hafte ‘Making considerable progress in one week’ or be ezafe-ye poroje, ye gozaresh ham bayad neveshte beshe ‘In addition to the project, a report also has to be written’.

5.3.3 Emphasizing Joint Goals
In Clark’s model of conversation, conversations are joint actions with one or more joint projects. In other words, they are tasks with goals that the speakers accomplish together. This appeared in the way the request conversations were held. Students frequently emphasised some point in common—usually a high quality project—that the professor would care about. The student tries in part to frame the request as helping to achieve the professor’s goals. For instance, in pair 11 (both speakers with low SE; Excerpt 5.6), the student could not submit an impressive piece due to having many required courses (see also Excerpt 5.3). He asked for an extension or any other suggestion for how to achieve the goal of a good project. The professor believed that the benefit of the project went to the student, and it should not be done only for the sake of the mark. He also added that the student could get a mark from his final exam but
should have worked on the project earlier. Upon asking about the kind of problem and how much of the work has been done, the student claimed that he could compile and write up the project but was not sure about the professor’s criterion. The student explained he wanted to earn a good GPA in order to apply for jobs, raising an even broader goal that the professor might desire; however, the student changed his mind and expressed that, if extending the time is not possible, he would complete the project and submit it at the due date. The professor then confirmed that both making a good project and time management are important. Excerpts 5.3 and 5.4 provide further examples of sharing goals where students ended their reasons with ‘submitting a significantly improved project’.

Excerpt 5.6

25 S: bad mikhastam begam ke ye khorde hajmesh sang-e. Bad in darsa ham ye jori-ye ke...in vahedha ke bardashtam hamash takhassosi-yeye. Aslan nemishe ke chiz kard ke resond ono begim, magar inke bekhyym ye chizi sar-e hambandi konim bedim ke oonam ke... injori ke az shoma shenidim migan ke aa shoma mamoolan ye chiz e kheyli kamelo dorost hesabi mikhayn. Be hamin khater man goftam ke nemirese ta oon mohlati ke gozashtid. Man mikhham tahiye konam ino. Hala agar ke emkanesh hast ya ino be estelah vaghtesho bishtar konid ya inke fekri be halesh bokonin.

I wanted to say that the project is a bit dense. All the courses are sort of, the courses all I’ve taken in this semester are required. I can’t make it at all unless to turn in something like a mediocre work, that is… But we heard that err you expect a complete project. For that reason, I can’t meet the deadline. I want to finish it. If it would be possible, either extend the time or think the other thing.

26 H: negah konin in poroje haei ke hast, bishtar bara komak be khodetoone-e. Man ina ro hala bara in nazashtam ke shoma ye joori ino anjam bedin ke tamoom beshe bedid be man va ye nomre-ehi begirin. Ina bara in-e ke roo mozo bishtar savar beshin, bishtar kar-e tahghighi anjam bedin. Negah konin, alan shoma 2 haftie vaght darin bara on kar ke tahlil bedin. Alan khob, entahana ham hast, har chand shoma belakhare bayad barnameye behtari mirikhin, zoodtar ino shoro mikardin. Alan kari aslan darbarash anjam dadin ya...?

Look, these given projects are actually for yourself, they are to help you. I don’t want you to work on them in order to turn them in and get a mark. The projects are for learning more about these topics, and do more research. Look, you have 2 weeks to go to submit it. At present, well, there are final exams as well. However, you should have made a better schedule to start it earlier. Have you ever worked on it so far or…?
S: تحقیق ان با کارم می‌باشد. چگونه کارشناسی آزمایشگاهی از این امکان وجود ندارد شما این موضوع را چگونه می‌پرسید؟ یعنی کارشناسی بسیاری از این موضوع را بسیار ساده می‌باشد.

درمان یک مطالعه و تحقیق در حالات آزمایشگاهی.

من بررسی منابع کتابشناسی و منابع مرتبط را انجام داده‌ام. تهیه آنها ساده است اما اهمیتی دارد که چیزی را باید در مورد آن بحث کنیم و به عنوان مثال، چه قاعده‌ای وجود دارد؟ من آن را می‌دانم که کارشناسی را بسیار ساده می‌کند زیرا این کارشناسی برای شرایط نمی‌باشد.

H: خوب، شما به سختی می‌فکاره‌ید که به خوبی بازنمی‌گیرم و اخیراً در روز اخیر روزهای خوبی دارم. واقعاً این‌طور است. متأسفانه این‌طوری است.

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

S: نه. زیرا در این شرایط، من دارم رشد می‌کنم. یعنی من می‌خواهم چیزی که کوچک بوده و مثلاً این مدل را کنار خواهم داشت.

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

H: خوب، من، می‌گویم، اما من نمی‌خواهم که شرایط شما در روز‌های بعدی به خوبی بازگردد. واقعاً من این روزهای خوبی را دارم. واقعاً این‌طوری است.

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

H: خوب، من، می‌گویم، اما من نمی‌خواهم که شرایط شما در روز‌های بعدی به خوبی بازگردد. واقعاً من این روزهای خوبی را دارم. واقعاً این‌طوری است.

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

S: این مسائل درباره پروژه‌ی من؟ یا…؟

H: خوب، من، می‌گویم، اما من نمی‌خواهم که شرایط شما در روز‌های بعدی به خوبی بازگردد. واقعاً من این روزهای خوبی را دارم. واقعاً این‌طوری است.
Well, I, you know, err {pause} I don’t want to put pressure, as you said, not to receive a good piece in the end. But I want both a good work as well as time-management. Well, but err until the end of the final exam period which will be around

35 S: *4 hafte dige*  
Four weeks later

36 H: *4 hafte dige. Khob, khoob-e oon modat baratoon ke roosh kar konin?*  
Four weeks later. Well, would this period of time work for you to work on it?

37 S: *are*  
Yes

38 H: *chon 2 haft bad az emtahanetoon vaght dari va ghashang roosh kar konin.*  
Because you have two weeks after the exams, work on it properly.

39 S: *age kob ta 2 hafte bad az emtahanat bashe, are mishe. Mammon misham.*  
If well, it is two weeks after taking the final exams, yes it'd be possible. I’m thankful.

40 H: *khob khoob-e?*  
Well, alright?

41 S: *are, fekr mikonam.*  
Yes, I think so.

42 H: *khob age injoori-ye, manam sakht nemigiram hala dar in mored. Vali khob kar-e khoob mikham dige azaton.*  
Well, if it is like that, I am not fussy in this case. But I want an improved project from you.

43 S: *han bad khoob manzooretoon?*  
Well, so you mean?

Well look, if you err put efforts into the project you’re working on and look for different sources, study different articles, it shows you understand the topic and I will realise that from the introduction, and result and discussion parts. My teaching experiences over these years taught me whether you worked properly or not.
Framing actions as working towards a mutual goal occurs in both directions. The student emphasises the importance of quality in the professor’s assignment, and the professor emphasises the importance of the student’s education and skills. These are classic positive politeness procedures, but can also be seen as a natural consequence of conversation being joint actions where tasks are accomplished together. This altered understanding can also be seen in the reticence to use the second person in requests.

As discussed in 4.2.1.1, Persian often avoids ‘you’. We see this in the requests made. In pairs 7 and 2 (all speakers with high SE; Excerpt 5.7), the indirect hint and the conventionally indirect request specifically do not mention ‘you’ or the professor. When ‘you’ is present, it exists as the object of the verb ask, specifying the direction of the question, but not of the request itself (Excerpt 5.8; pair 4, both speakers with high SE). This pattern holds often. Of 10 pairs with high self-esteem, 7 pairs did not address the ‘requestee’ (pairs 1, 2, 3, 7, 15, 17, 18) and of 8 pairs with low self-esteem, 4 pairs (pairs 8, 9, 10, 16) did not, either. Therefore, high self-esteem pairs did not address the ‘requestee’ more than low self-esteem pairs. ‘You’ is addressed only in seven pairs, three pairs with high self-esteem and four pairs with low self-esteem, in which there are five conventional indirect and two direct requests (of two direct requests).

Excerpt 5.7

Pair 7 HH, indirect hint: “I know I must be on time but I have a part-time job. For that reason, I am doubtful, I don’t know…”

Pair 2 HH, conventionally indirect: “I wondered if it’d be possible to submit my project with a delay.”

Excerpt 5.8

Pair 4 HH, conventionally indirect: “I wanted to ask you if it would be possible for you to extend the time a bit so I can turn it in to you a few days later.”

With an interactional/conversational perspective, an additional motivation for this lexical choice other than sounding polite comes into focus. The request is treated as a joint activity on multiple levels. On one level, the request conversation itself must be accomplished. On another level, the speakers accomplish setting goals using the conversations, such as developing research skills, learning time management, writing a good research project, etc. together.
Within this framework, students often focus not on what the professor will do but what they themselves will do to accomplish the goal. Therefore, there may not be a simple rule “‘you’ is impolite”, but rather “focus on what I will do to complete the task” which then results in ‘you’ not being used.

5.3.4 Accepting the Request
There were different acceptance rates for speakers with high and low self-esteem. Overall, of 10 pairs with high self-esteem, 8 pairs were successful including those who received conditional results (see section 5.3.5), while of 8 pairs with low self-esteem, only 4 pairs had their request granted. Successful reasons include be khater-e feshar-e karay-e darsay-e dige ‘due to pressure of studying other courses,’ bekhater-e ye seri moshkelat-e khonevadegi/bekhater-e ye seri masael-e shakhsi ‘due to family/personal issues’ (see also Table 5.1). However, a similar reason bekhater-e ye seri masael-e shakhsi va mikham moaddelam bekesham bala ‘due to personal issues and to improve my GPA’ in pair 10 (both speakers with low SE; Excerpt 5.4) was rejected.

It is possible that the way in which high self-esteem speakers approached the request was different. High self-esteem speakers had a tendency to return to previously introduced reasons in later turns, which was less for low self-esteem speakers (see Table 5.2). High self-esteem speakers also tended to have multiple requests in their negotiations (see section 4.4.2). Speakers who either moved directly into long requests like speaker 5 (with low SE; Excerpt 5.3) or had long requests allowing negotiation such as speakers 9, 10, 12 (all speakers with low SE) often failed. A long request was not a guarantee of acceptance mostly for low self-esteem speakers. However, high self-esteem speakers who either worked slowly up to their request or moved directly into the request were successful.

5.3.5 Co-Determining the Request
The classic understanding of a request is that a speaker requests something of a hearer and the hearer then accepts or rejects that request (e.g., Searle, 1969, 1976; see section 2.2). The speaker then is the one who determines what the request is about and for. In these role play conversations, this determination was much more complicated.
The scenario cards instructed the requester to ask for an extension; however, the exact details of the extension, such as its length, are unspecified. Nevertheless, when performing the request role play, those details had to be negotiated. The key finding is that the requester did not arrive with all details of what they were asking for worked out already. Rather, the precise request is co-constructed during the conversation. The scenario cards did not demand this pattern. For example, a role play could have been, “May I have an extension?”, to which the requestee responds, “Yes” and then they both stopped role playing. However, the speakers all took “act out a request” as some larger task. Both speakers decide through interaction what exactly the request is. Speakers behave in such a way that they make multiple questions around topics, provide reasons, reframe requests and talk about consequences or expectations before moving to end the conversation.

How details such as time and place are negotiated over different turns is not the focus of either internal or external categories of Trosborg’s (1995) modifications. For example, in pair 2 (both speakers with high SE; Excerpt 5.9), the exact amount of time was a focus of the conversation (turns 15-22) and the student proposed two more weeks than the deadline, but the professor thought less than two weeks was enough. Then the professor proposed one week and decided one week would be the maximum time given to the student.

Excerpt 5.9

15 S: va age betoonam masalan ye 2 hafte dige vaght dashte basham, nemidoonam hala shoma key mikhayn nomre ha ro taeid bokonin.
If I can have two more weeks, I don’t know when you want to finalise the marks.

16 A: rastesh ro behhay are, chon man bayad bargeha ro tahvil bedam va nomreha ro vared-e sayt bokonam. Midoonid ke, ma ham ye mohlati darim.
The truth is that yes, I have to send the papers back and to finalise/to submit the marks. You know that, we also have a deadline.

17 S: bale
Yes

18 A: ke daneshgah rooy-e oon kheyli hasas hastesh. Banabarin eee 2 hafte ke {maks} chegadr ta alan pishraft kardi?
That, it is very important to the university, so err two weeks {pause} how much have you had progress so far?

19 60% poroje taghriban.
Roughly 60% of the project.

60% khoob khoob-e. Fekr nemikonan 2 hafte... Age vaghtet azad bashe, fekr mikonam mitoni ke to kamtar az 2 hafte anjamesh bedi. Ala ayohal shoma talasheto bokon. Well, 60% is good. I don’t think two weeks... If you have free time, I think you can do it in less than two weeks. However, do your best.

dorost-e
Right

va hafte bad yani say kon ta oonjaei ke mitooni dast-e por biyay. Hafte bad biya, yani yek hafte chon man dige taghriban hafte bad ya hala 8-9 roz dige.
And come next week with a full hand as much as you can. Come next week, it means one week. Because I [have to finalise them] approximately next week or 8-9 days later.

Another instance is pair 1 (both speakers with high SE; Excerpt 5.10) where the student proposed one more week, the professor then proposed two days, then the student asked for 3 or 4 days, and then later Wednesday afternoon was made as a final decision. However, the reason that the student shifted from 3 or 4 days to Wednesday is because the professor shifted the perspective asking “Until when?” The student then changed from a number of days to an end point for the task. In other words, the student did not walk in and request, “Professor, may I have until Wednesday afternoon to complete the documentation?” Rather, the specific conversation evolved in that direction over its course with both the student and professor making critical contributions to arrive at this destination. The exact form of the request “complete primarily (basic) documentation by Wednesday afternoon” was determined by both the requester and requestee.

Excerpt 5.10

S: mmm fekr mikonan payam termam ro khoob neveshte basham. Monteha, hanoz forsatz nakardam ke kamel eee poroje ro tahvil amade bokonam va tahvil-e shoma bedam.
Umm I think I did well in the final exam, but I haven’t found any chance to complete the project and submit it to you.

A: ta key mikhayn shoma tahvil bedin?
Until when do you want to submit [it]?

S: chon term 2 ham ast, sal-e dovomam hastim ye meghdar hajm-e kara (mokhatab mipare vasat)
Because we are in the second [academic] semester, we are in the second year of the study, the amount of work {interrupted by the addressee}

04 A: shoma daneshjooein. Bayad be moghe... kar-e dige-ei ke nadarin; bayad be moghe karatono anjam bedin. Aslan az vijegihay-e daneshjoo in-e ke karasho be moghe anjam bede va sar-e vaght porojasho tahvil dade bashe va baray-e chi? Shoma ke kar-e dige-ei nadarin. Baray-e chi vaght-e ezafi mikhayn?
You are a student. [You] Must be on time. You don’t have anything else to do. You must do your work on time. One of the features of a student is to do his work on time and to submit his project at the due time. And for what? You don’t have to do anything else, what do you want extension for?

05 S: hagh ba shomast ostad; kamelan ham dorost migin. Monteha chon ma sal-e dovom hastim, darsay-e dige ham bod. Ye meghdar feshar-e kari, makhsoosan payan term ziyad boode. Mikhashtam ke age beshe, faghat ye hafte dige be ma forsat bedin ke man betoonam in poroje ro amade bokonam {mokhatab mipare vasat}
You’re right, Professor; you are completely right. But because we’re in the second year of the study, there are also other courses to study. And we were under pressure a little to study other subjects, too, particularly there have been many final exams. I wondered if it’d be possible to give us a chance only one more week that I can finish this project {interrupted by the addressee}

06 A: man faghat mitoonam ta pas farda be shoma forsat bedam; ta pas farda baram biyarinesh.
I can just give you two more days extension at maximum. Turn it in by the day after tomorrow.

07 S: ostad, ta pas farda?
Professor, till the day after tomorrow?

08 A: dige hadd-e aksaresh. Man be daneshjoo hich vaght hamchin...chon man ke motaghedam shoma bayad karatono be moghe anjam bedin, eee darsetono be moghe bekhonin, porojaton...ye modat-e toolani vaght dahstin ke inkaro anjam bedin. Man bishtar az 2 rooz nemitoonam be shoma forsat bedam.
This is the maximum [time]. I never give a student such [extension]...because I do believe you must do your work at the due time, err you should study on time, your project...[you] had plenty of time to work on your project. I can’t give you the extension more than 2 days.

09 S: ostad, man koll-e karo taghriban anjam dadam. Faghat document kardanesh monde, vali khob onam hadeaghal yek hafte {mokhatab mipare vasat}
Professor, I’ve almost done the work. The documentation is just left, but well, it takes one week at least {interrupted by the addressee}

Well, it’s not so difficult, you sit. It’s not too much left, you sit [spend your time] to work on it tonight and tomorrow. I don’t think that needs too much work.

S: *man tamam-e talasham mikonam vali age ehyanan {cheshmak mizane} masalan hala, ta 3-4 rooz-am tool keshid, kharesh mikonam ke ejaze bedid man ta {mokhatab mipare vasat}*

I try my best but if probably {blink} for example, it takes 3-4 days longer, please kindly allow me to {interrupted by the addressee}

A: *nahayatan chand shanbe shoma mitonid bara man biyaridesh? Ta key?*

Until what day at maximum can you turn it in for me? Until when?

S: *man age hamin alan shoro bekonam be neveshtan, fekr mikonam ke ta charshanbe bad az zohr betoonam baraton email bekonam age eshkal nadashte bashe?*

If I start writing it right now, I think I can email it to you on Wednesday afternoon if it doesn’t mind?

A: *charshanbe bad az zohr akharin forsati-e ke man mitoonam be shoma bedam.*

Wednesday afternoon is the deadline I can give you.

Reasons for the request have long been known to occur as part of request conversations, which is why they are a possible external supportive move in speech act coding schemas. However, looking at requests as conversations gives a different view of the reasons from looking at a request as a speech act. The supportive moves concept focuses on the single request speech act made by the requester (no focus on turns by the requestee), and then argues that supportive moves build that request up. When examining the request in an interactive conversation, it becomes clear that there are some moves that, while important to the particular flow of the conversation and hence the request’s success, do not fit into any particular code in Trosborg’s (1995) schema. As discussed above, pair 1 (Excerpt 5.10) and pair 2 (Excerpt 5.9) show how turns described what the student has done, what is left and how long the completion will take. The professors considered the amount of work and time left in their decision. Regarding an extension, which is inherently about time, time is very likely to be mentioned. Such moves discussing time have a role in the conversation for keeping the negotiation on, but the content might not fit into any particular request classification. For example, ‘Roughly 60% of the project’ (turn 19, Excerpt 5.9), which talked about the amount of the work completed, could not be considered as a supportive reason or a preparatory strategy, but it affected the
professor’s decision. Another example is ‘Professor, I’ve almost done the work. The
documentation is just left, but well, it takes one week at least’ (turn 21, Excerpt 5.10), which
would not fall into any category of Trosborg’s supportive moves, was considered in the
requestee’s response.

Critically, this does not argue that a new category should be added to Trosborg’s coding
scheme. Traditional speech act coding is designed to identify common linguistics forms that
accompany the request act. A conversational perspective has a different purpose–identifying
the knowledge and skills needed to participate in a request-oriented interaction. Information
about what is and is not complete, for example, is only important in the unique history of a
specific interaction.

Beyond negotiating a detail such as the time of the extension, sometimes the request was
altered substantially. In one conversation the speakers (pair 3, both speakers with high SE;
Excerpt 5.11) agreed in the end that the student would email a significantly improved project in
one week. Initially, the student proposed a one-week extension. However, the professor made
several moves to refine what exactly was being granted. The most critical was that the request
was being granted for a project of significantly higher quality than the one that existed in draft
state at the time of conversation. One might think of this as the professor putting a condition on
the request. However, the professor was arguably changing the request itself. When students
ask for more time, they are requesting that they be allowed to submit an assignment at some
later date. The professor made it very clear that the student was in fact being allowed to submit
a significantly improved assignment. No other form of student action was permissible. It was
also the professor who initiated the way in which the project would be turned in, email in this
case, not the student, which is different from pair 1 (speaker with high SE, addressee with low
SE; Excerpt 5.10) where the student suggested email.

Excerpt 5.11

71 S: *kheyli mamnoon agha-ye doctor.*
Thank you Mr Dr.

72 A: *badesh vase man email mikonid? Ya poroj ro...*
Then will you email me? Or the project...

73 S: *bale*  
Yes
74 A: ya on poroje ro khaftid...
Or you want the project...

75 S: harjoor shoma salah midoonid.
Whatever you suggest.

76 A: faghat behem begid, zekr konid ke ba man sohbat kardid ke yek hafte dirtar bedid.
Just remind me, mention it that you have talked to me to send it to me a week later.

The participants sometimes generally disagree with what the nature of the request. The student enters with a plan to request more time for work. However, the professor sometimes reframes the request. He might say that the student is requesting special treatment, rather than time. If that understanding of the request remains, then the request might be rejected. The professor has reframed the request from a different point of view.

Failure to get the extension stops the negotiation towards choosing a specific time; however, the initial request could be reframed. Like pair 5 (Excerpt 5.3), pair 8 (speaker with low SE, addressee with high SE; Excerpt 5.12), the request for more time was not granted, either. This was also done by the professor actively changing what the request was about. The professor changed the request to be about making exceptional rules for the student. The student never successfully adjusted the request back to more time to write the project. This new request to make exceptional rules was not approved.

Excerpt 5.12

I have ‘X’ (COURSE’s NAME) with you. But I know because this is a bit hard in terms of theory, I have to work on it more to make it conceptualised. For that reason, I can’t submit the project to you. I can submit it, but it’s not like what I’d like to be and it should be, then I can’t submit it to you.

02 A: harjoori ke hast tahvil bedin ta akhar-e vaght.
Whatever it is, submit it by the deadline.
S: faghat mikhastam ino motmaen besham. Biam inja azatoon beporsam chon midoonam ke rooy-e nomre-ye payan termam kheyli tasir mizare vali {maks}
I just wanted to make sure about it. I came to ask you about it because I know that this project’s mark would affect my final mark {pause}

A: man nemitoonam kari dar in zamine bokonam. Shoma dalil-e movajjahi darid bara takhriretoon?
I can’t be of more help to you in this regard. Do you have a convincing reason for your delay?

S: eee na dalil movajjahi ke nemishe goft dashte basham. Vali ye meghdar behkater-e in ke
Err, no. My reason is not satisfying, but it was a bit because of that…

A: behkater-e in ke...
Because of…

S: na faghat be khater-e in masale ke...
Not only because of these problems that…

A: ta harjaeisho ke neveshtin tavil bedin chon sharayet baray-e hame bayad mosavi bashe dige.
Submit what you have completed so far because the conditions must be equal for everyone then.

S: bale
Yes

A: nemitoonam ke. Age gharar bashe be shoma vaght bedam, bayad be hame vaght bedam.
I can’t [do it] then. If I am supposed to extend the time for you, I have to extend it for everyone.

S: bale
Yes

A: be har hal age dars vase shoma sangin-e, bara hame sangin-e.
Anyway, if the course is hard for you, it is hard for all, too.

S: aslan emkanesh hast ke ye meghdari vase hame bishtar vaghto dar nazare begiridi ya na? Chon man fekr mikonam in moshkelo aksar-e daneshjoooha ham daran.
Would it be ever possible to consider a bit extra time for everyone or not? Because I think this is the problem that most of the students have.
A: vallah shoma avvalin nafari hastin ke omadin inja. Actually, you are the first person that come here.

S: khob shayad man avvalin nafari bodam ke be khodam ejaze dadam ke biyam sohbat konam. Baghiye shayad rooshoon nashe hala. Well, maybe I am the first person who is brave to come to talk about it. Others may feel shy [to come].

A: aaa
Aaa

S: hala inam age beshet, mishe fekr mikonam. If this would be possible, it’s possible I think.

A: be har hal emrooz rooz-e akhar-e o kheyli ham dir-e baray-e inke in tasmimo begirim. Baghiye ham haminghadr vaght dashtan, kesi dige-ei ham ta hala chizi nagoft. In-e ke moteassemfam. Anyway, today is the last day [and] it’s also very late to make this decision. The other students have also had the same time; no one else hasn’t yet complained anything. I am sorry for that.

S: kheyli khob. Alright.

A: man behtarin pishnahadi ke mitoonam behetoon bokonam in-e ke {maks} porojatoon ro ta har jaei ke hast alan ast, tahvil bedin. Ta har jaei ke tahvil dade bashin nomrasho migirin. Az in be bad ham inshallah baghiyasho jobran mikonid tooy-e akhar-e term. The best suggestion I can give to you is {pause} that to turn in your current draft. With this submission, you would get your score for what you have completed. From now on, I hope so, you can improve it in the final exam.

Again, a request is typically understood as the requester asking the requestee to take some action (e.g., Trosborg, 1995; see section 2.2.1). However, the request conversations almost always ended with the professor deciding what actions the student will perform. Declaring the certain actions a person will do was one of the main topics in the conversations. Actions that the students have to take are presented in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3

Samples of Taking an Action by Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taking an action(s)</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amade kardan-e gozaresh-e avvaliye</td>
<td>Completing primarily (basic) documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anjam dadan-e poroje dar had-e ghabel-e ghabooli</td>
<td>Doing the project to some acceptable extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahvil-e ye poroje-ye kheyli khoob</td>
<td>Submitting a significantly improved project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamam kardan poroje be moghe</td>
<td>Getting the project done by the deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avordan-e poroje be moghe</td>
<td>Turning the project in by the deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age poroje tamoom nashod ta 10 roz ghabl az mohlat-e taein shode, raftan be dafat-e ostad va dobare sohab kardan dar mord-e vaght-e ezafe</td>
<td>Going to the professor’s office 10 days before the deadline and negotiating the extension again if the project was not finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahvil dadan-e poroje ta har jaei ke hast</td>
<td>Submitting the project with this current draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komak gereftan az dostan-e dige</td>
<td>Getting help from other friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pishraft-e ghabel-e tavajoh dashtan</td>
<td>Making huge progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clark (1996, p. 331) discussed that actions are determined in the conversation through establishing joint commitments. In pair 11 (Excerpt 5.6), the professor checked the time from the day they were discussing the extension until the final exams finished with the student and clarified that when the exams ended, there were two weeks left and then asked the student: *khob, khoob-e oon modat baratoon ke roosh kar konin?* ‘Well, would this period of time (this extension) work for you to work on it?’ at move 36. The student was happy that the deadline was two weeks after the exam finished. Here, too, the participants did not plan the conversation, but created the new deadline along the way. The negotiation was positive because the professor proposed ‘the deadline is by the end of the final exam period which is four weeks later’ which was based on the professor’s assumption. The decision was then made at turn 38 and was confirmed by the student at turn 41; the determination was made by both of them, showing their coordinated joint action. In total, the negotiation took 20 turns.
Actions taken by the professors are provided in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4

**Samples of Taking an Action by Professors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taking an action(s)</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>moarrefi manabe-e bishtar</em></td>
<td>Introducing more sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nazar dadan rooy-e poroje ya be tor-e khas javab danande eshkalat</em></td>
<td>Giving feedback on the current draft or answering the student’s questions specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gozaresh dadan in masale be masoolin baray-e hal-e masale</em></td>
<td>Reporting the issue to other staff to sort out the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>negah andakhtan be poroje bad az inke pishrafi anjam shod</em></td>
<td>Looking at the project and giving the extension after progress is made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zaman bandi baray-e baghiye daneshjooyan chetoor khahad bood</em></td>
<td>Determining how time management is going for other students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The request task is both determining an exact action and reaching a decision on that action. The professor, the requestee of the scenario cards, often does retain control of this final decision, despite the action being one that is negotiated. In all pairs, the professor was involved in determining the action. In twelve pairs, the professor made the decision by himself. In six pairs—pairs 1, 13, 17 (all speakers with high SE), pairs 11, 14 (all speakers with low SE), and pair 16 (speaker with low SE, addressee with high SE)—both student and professor were involved; self-esteem shows no interesting pattern in final determination. For example, in pair 17 (both speakers with high SE; Excerpt 5.13), the student asked for an extension due to a busy schedule. When the student was asked “How much time?,” a one-week or 10-day extension was requested. The professor then asked about the kind of problem the student had. The student’s answer was the number of courses and projects he had to work on. The professor then asked for confirmation that one-week or 10-day extension was enough for the student, because the professor put a condition for this favour to get an improved project. After the determination was made by both professor and student, the student asked if this extension would affect his final mark and the professor ensured him it will be alright if an improved work was submitted.
as discussed. The negotiation section started right after the initial request and took 14 turns (lines 15-28). Line 28 by the professor contains the final decision right before saying thank yous and the goodbye as both parties accepted the decision.

Excerpt 5.13

15 S: man kheyli vaghtetono nemigiram vali eee bara poroje-ye akhar-e term man mozahemeton shodam. Eee bayad tamoom mishod ye tarikh-e moshakhasti dade boodin. Man eee fekr konam, ghatan midoonin man sal-e 2 karshenasi arshadam. Dige taghriban dars hay-e aslim monde bara inke in termam begiram eee nemiresam moteasefane. Mitoonam taghriban nazdik-e oon tarikh ke dadin beheton bedam vali nemiresam ke sar-e hamon tarikh beheton bedam payan nama ro {maks} I don’t want to take up too much of your time but err I disturbed you for the final project. Err it should have been finished by the deadline for which you’ve assigned a date. I err think, you surely know I am in the second year of my master’s program. The required courses are still to be taken in this semester. Err I can’t turn it in by the deadline unfortunately but can do it close to this date {pause}

16 A: cheghadr, cheghadr fasele? How much time [how many extra days]?

17 S: man {makes} man fekr konam age ye hafte ta 10 rooz, ye hafte say mikonam. Mitoonam akhar-e hafte, yek hafte age be man forsat bedin. Nemidoonam man. Age yadetoon bashe aslan, man sar-e kelasatoo hamaro oomade boodam, kara ro karde boodam. Moteasefane {makes} mitoonam be moghe bedam vali oonjori ke doost daram oonvaght nemishe. Mitoonam {maks} shayad kheyli saih nabshe, vali mitoonam az yeki begiram kopi konam, az ye jay-e dige peyda konam vali doost daram chon darseetoon ro doost daram, darst ke darin doost daram. Doost dashtam karo vaghei anjam bedam. Ye kam bishtar az mohlati ke be man dadin dar vaghe. I {pause} I think if a week or 10 days, I try [to do it] in a week. I can do it by the end of this week, if you give me one more week. I don’t know. If you recall, I’ve attended all your classes [and] did all the assignments. Unfortunately, {pause} I can turn it in on time but it can’t be like I would like to. It might not be good [to say this], but I can copy a project or find one from somewhere but I would like to do this project because I like your course. I would like to do an original work. A bit more time than what you’ve actually given to me.

18 A: moshkeletoon chi hast faghat? Just what’s your problem?

19 S: hamoontori ke goftam man term-e 4 hastam, sal dovomiam. Dare taghriban tamoom mishe. Ye seri darsay-e najoor baghi ham monde, ro baghiye ha ham bayad kar konam.
Na inke bekham bahane biyaram ke baghiye mohemtaran, vali 2-3 ta dars haei ke monde hamashoon mohemman. Roo hame-am bayad kar beshe. Shoma ham ke dige inja dars midin ashnaein payan term ha hame mamoolan nazdik-e haman, ba 2-3 rooz ekhtelaf-e. Oonaei ham ke bekham payan nameha ro azashoon begiram oona ham hame nazdik-e ham-e poroje ha. Bara hamin ye kam, ye kam hamechi ghati shode bood. Man age betoonam, age beshe bishtar vaght gozasht ke, kheyli behtar-e.

As I said, I am in the fourth semester, in the second year. I am about to end [the degree]. There are a lot of projects to work on. I didn’t say this to make an excuse that other projects are more important than this but there are 2-3 courses which are important and I have to work on them as well. You teach here and are familiar with the process. The final exams all are usually close to each other with just 2-3 days distance. The ones that I would like to choose for my thesis topic are close to each other. A bit busy schedule. If I can, if it’d be possible to spend more time on it, it’d be much better.

20 A: khob ye hafte 10 rooz kafi-ye?
   Well, a week [or] 10 days is enough?

21 S: are
   Yes

22 A: ya inke bad az ye hafte 10 rooz shoma mikhay begi ke...?
   Or after this a one-week or 10-day extension, do you want to say that…?

   No no no. I do my hardest to finish it up in a week to 10 days.

   It’s alright. If only one-week or 10-day extension, not a problem.

25 S: dasteton...tasiri ro nomre ina nadare ehyanan?
   Thank…wouldn’t it (this extra extension) likely affect my final mark?

   No no. Not a problem.

27 S: bashe.
   Okay.

28 A: age be shart-e inke kar be hamoon keyfiyyati ke dar moredesh dari sohbat mikoni anjam mishe, moshkeli nist.
   If your project is being done with the improvement you’re talking about, not a problem.
However, a few determinations were not made clearly since professors put a condition on the request and the final decision was dependent on the action the student would take. The final determinations were conditional for mostly the high self-esteem pairs: Pair 13 (both speakers with high SE), pair 15 (speaker with high SE, addressee with low SE), pair 18 (speaker with high SE, addressee with low SE), and one low self-esteem pair (pair 12). For example, in pair 18 (Excerpt 5.14), because the student had to work and study simultaneously, he asked for an extension. When the professor understood the student could not attend the classes regularly, he wondered why this problem had not been discussed earlier because other students did discuss their problems before. As the conversations were unplanned and the student might not expect to hear that other classmates discussed their problem earlier, the student then reframed his request to a possibility of group work, but it was not accepted. As the professor looked for a convincing reason, he further asked about his topic. Through negotiation (turns 9-30) the professor was satisfied that the student’s job and field were relevant and decided to facilitate submitting the project, not extending the time; so the request was changed by the professor within 22 turns. However, the professor added he should look at the project when it was ready; he would then make the final determination in the next meeting. The conversation was under the control of professor, despite the fact that the student was making the request, and the determination was conditional on future action, but the extension was rejected at the time of conversation.

Excerpt 5.14

09 S: are fogh-e lisans. Bad valla eee didam in peyghameton ro ke, didam akhar-e term bayad ma biyaym porojam oo. Man hala porojam ro tarif kardam valla vali moshkel in-e ke fekr nemikonam betoonam ta oon moghe tarikhi ke farmoodin betoonam tahviles bedam. Be nazaretoon rahi dare?
Yes, the Master’s program. Actually, err I saw your reminder that we have to turn in our project. I have worked on the outline of the project, but now there is a problem that I don’t think I can submit it to you by the deadline assigned. Do you think there is a way?

10 A: shoma sar-e kelas ha hastin ya...?
Are you [regularly] participating in the classes or...?

11 S: valla bazi vaghta hastim bazi vaghta nistim.
Sometimes I sit in the classes, sometimes not.

12 A: khob hamoon.
Well, that’s it.

   Because I have to go to work, I have to do [leave the classes] sometimes. I can’t do [both].

14 A: na man kari be karetoon nadaram vali khob shoma bayad dar vaghe, man ino avval-e kelaš kheyli vazeh vaseye daneshjoohaa moshakhas mikonam ke dar vaghe dar kelas bayad hozoor dashte bashin. Va ma raje be in mozo fekr mikonam ba daneshjoohaa chandin bar sohbat kardim va ye seri moshkelat matrah shode ke dar vaghe daneshjoohaa moshkeleshooon hal shode. Eee man fekr nemikonam ma betoonim dar vaghe dore-ye zaman-e in poroje ro avazesh bokonim. Shoma alan moshkeletoon daghighan mishe bishtar vase man tozih bedin ke moshkelet chi-ye?
   No, I don’t want to comment on your job, but well, you must actually, I explained this to all students clearly that they have to attend the classes. And we talked about this, I think, with students several times and they talked about their problems which have been sorted out later. Err I don’t think I can extend the time for the project.
   Can you explain your problem more for me that what it is?

   As I said before, I said, what’s up? {smile} Excuse me, professor. Because I have to go to work, I have a bit of a time limitation. Probably I was not present at the class that you talked about such stuff, to speak with you about our problems.

16 A: dorost-e
   Right

17 S: bara hamin ye khorde zamanbandim ye khorde zaeif-e to in term va nemitoonam ye khorde karaei ke farmoodin beresam. Hamin ke betoonam darso pas konam kheyli baram bas-e. Vali nemidoonam hala hich raši hast ke man ba daneshjoohaye dige baham poroje erae bedim ya masalan ye rahkari ke man betoonam?
   For that reason, I am not good at time management in this semester and can’t spend enough time on the project. It’s enough for me that I pass this course which is very important for me. But I don’t know if is there any way that I can do a group project with other students or for example, [is there] any other alternative that I can?

18 A: poroje ha, poroje ha be soorat-e fardi hast. Oon, oon halat ke emkan nadare. Alan mozoei ke entekhab kardin taghriban chi-ye? Mitoonin be man tozih bedin ke...?
The projects are presented individually. Group-work, it’d not be possible. What’s the topic of your project? Can you explain it to me?

19 S: valla ma dar mored-e sayalat-e. Yani sohbati ke hala man ba bacheha kardamoo ina, nazaram in-e ke khodam man roo ghesmati kar konam ke rooy-e sayalat-e tooy-e loolehay-e nafti, hala biyaym too harekateshono, vakonesheshoon be looleha age khordegi dashte bashe chejoori vakonesh neshoon mide. Mikhaym ro oon kar konim. Mozoe jadidi-ye. Didam to san’at ham estefade mishe vali khob hala nemidoonam age moshkel-e vaghtam, be khosos in ye poroje sangin-e faghat.

Actually, my project is about ‘Fluid’. It means with the discussion that I had with my classmates, my idea is that I myself work on this part of Fluid in the movement of oil channels and also their reaction if they are faulty. I’d like to work on that. This is a new topic and I noticed that it’s practical in the industrial market, but I don’t know if the time limitation lets me [work on it], especially this project is just a bit dense.

20 A: shoma agha-ye bebakhshid?
You, Mr excuse me?

21 S: ‘FAMIL’ hastam.
I am ‘FAMILY NAME’.

22 A: ‘FAMIL’ karet dar che zaminei-ye?
‘FAMILY NAME’, what’s your job about?

23 S: valla kar-e man, too sherkat-e naftam va karam hamin marboot…
I am working for an oil company and my job is on…

24 A: pas kar-e mortabet dari anjam midi.
So your work is relevant to your study.

25 S: bale, bale.
Yes, yes.

26 A: {makes} valla ma mamoolan, man ye hamchin revalio ghabool nemikonom vali ba tavajoh be inke khob, mibinam kari ke darin mikonin arzeshesho shayad dashte bashe. Va khob dari kar-e mortabet ham anjam midi. Shayad betoonam ye {makes} dar vaghe mozo ro ye kami bara shoma tashilesh konim.
{pause} Actually, I don’t generally accept such reasons/requests, but with regard to your job relevant to your study well, I see it might be worthy. And because you’re working on a relevant topic. Perhaps I can {pause} actually facilitate this issue [submitting the project] for you.
27 S: dastetoon dard nakone.
   Appreciate it.

28 A: monteha eee kari ke anjam midim in-e ke shoma to hamoon dar vaghe baze-ei ke alam forsat dari, harcheghadresho mitooni anjam bede.
   However, err the thing we will do is to work on the project within the limited period in fact, whatever you can do.

29 S: chashm.
   Okay.

30 A: bad baham dobare ye jalese-ei khahim dasht.
   Then we will have another meeting.

Requests are often viewed with a simple question-response model. In this case, the student asks a question, the request, and the professor provides an answer. However, as can be seen in many of these excerpts, while the students may have initiated the request question, the professors asked far more questions in the conversations. It seems that professors know their role is to ask why this extension is being asked for, and no student showed surprise to get such questions. However, participants must be coordinated on these questions and answers. The most common question examples are presented in Table 5.5. That is one part of the knowledge the participants have to know in order to successfully participate in request conversation in Persian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kodoom dars ro shoma ba man darin?</td>
<td>Which course do you have with me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kelasa ro shoma be moghe miyayn?</td>
<td>Are you attending the classes regularly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bara chi vaght-e ezafi mikhayn?</td>
<td>What do you want an extension for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta key mikhayn shoma tahvil bedin?</td>
<td>Until when do you want to submit the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nahayatan chand shanbe shoma mitonid bara man biyaridesh? Ta key?</td>
<td>Until what maximum day can you bring it for me? Until when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moshkel inke migi hala takhir dashti chi boode?</td>
<td>What was the problem so that you are asking to turn in it with a delay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poroje jori boode ke vaght ziyad mikhad?</td>
<td>Is the project a kind of time-demanding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheghadr ta alan pishraft dashti?</td>
<td>How much progress have you had so far?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kar-e shoma? Shoma mote 'ahel hastid?</td>
<td>Your job? Are you married?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koodoom shahr shoma mirid?</td>
<td>From which city do you have to come?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoma miyan term-e avvalet chand shodi?</td>
<td>What was your first mid-term exam score?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chand roze dige darim ta akhar-e hafte?</td>
<td>How many days to go until the weekend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>che komaki mitoonam be shoma bekonam man?</td>
<td>How can I help you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yek hafte bishtar vaght, shoma fekr mikonid ke yek pishraft-e, ye taghir ziyadi?</td>
<td>Do you think that one more week can make a big change, considerable progress?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoma dalil-e movajjahi darid bara takhiretoon?</td>
<td>Do you have a convincing reason for your delay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alan kari aslan darbarash anjam dadin ya...?</td>
<td>Have you ever worked on it so far or…?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hala moshkeleton moshkel-e dars-e faghat?</td>
<td>Is your problem only related to the paper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khob, khoob-e oon modat baratoon ke roosh kar konin?</td>
<td>Well, would this period of time work for you to work on it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age moshkeli bood chera nayomadi zoodiar be man begi?</td>
<td>If you had a problem, why didn’t you tell me earlier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheghadr dige? Chand rooz dige lazem darid ke ezafe bar sazman?</td>
<td>How much more? How many days do you need extra beyond the deadline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitooni moshkeleo be man begi, masale chi-ye ke aghab negahet dashte?</td>
<td>Can you tell me what your problem is, what keeps you behind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mozooetoon chi boode?</td>
<td>What’s your project about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motmaeni mitooni jamesh bokoni?</td>
<td>Are you sure you can finish it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aya shoma fardi karo donbal kardin?</td>
<td>Are you working on your project individually?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questions moved the dialogues forward. Once the student had raised the request topic, the professor typically led by using questions such as in pair 13 (both speakers with high SE; Excerpt 5.15). Through a series of questions from the professor and answers from the student, a short extension was conditionally accepted. The student had to improve his work within two days before the deadline and then the professor would decide how many extra days would be given. Again, then, while the student initiated a request for an extension, it was the professor and student through conversation who determined exactly what actions would be taken—not the original requester.

Excerpt 5.15

08 A: kodoom poroje? kodoom poroje? kodoom dars?
Which project? Which project? Which course?

09 S: hamin poroje-ye darsi mmm ‘fiziology’ (ESM-e VAHED-e DARSI).
That project for the course umm ‘Physiology’ (COURSE’s NAME).

10 A: ‘fiziology 2’ ya ‘1’?
‘Physiology 2’ or ‘1’?

11 S: 2.
2.

12 A: 2, ahan, khob. Chi shode?
2, okay. So what’s wrong?

13 S: man ta akhar-e hafte mohlat daram vali motasafane natoonestam amade konam.
Mikham bebinam age lotf konid ye mohlat-e dige bedin tamdid konin.
The deadline is by the end of this week but unfortunately I can’t make it. I wonder if you kindly do me a favour [and] extend it.

14 A: ta akhar-e hafte? chand rooz dige darim ta akhar-e hafte?
By the end of this week? How many days to go until the weekend?

15 S: 2 rooz-e dige.
Two more days to go.

You have two more days. What’s the problem? What’s the issue?

17 S: moshkel {mokhatab mipare vasat}
The problem {interrupted by the addressee}

18 A: shoma ye mah vaght dashti alan avordi?! Age moshkeli bood chera nayomadi zoodtar be man begi ya inke moshkel?
You had one month, and now you come?! If you had a problem, why didn’t you discuss it with me earlier?

Sometimes a question is asked once and does not come up again. Other times, the question comes up again later with a change. For instance, in Excerpt 5.15, the professor asks Chi shode? ‘So what’s wrong?’ in turn 12, and later repeats his question slightly different moshkel chi-ye? Masale chi-ye? ‘What’s the problem? What’s the issue?’ in turn 16. Similarly, in Excerpt 5.4, the professor asks che dalili? Dalilesh chi-ye? ‘What’s the reason? What’s that reason?’ in turn 18 and later asks slightly different khob, akhe che moshkeli boode shoma natoonestid porojatoono anjam bedin? ‘Well, what’s been the problem [that] you couldn’t do your project?’ in turn 22.

Note that some of the questions are proposed or reframed in the form of alternatives or suggestions in a few dialogues. In pair 15 (speaker with high SE, addressee with low SE, turn 10), the professor suggested natoonestin ba hamkelasihay-e digaton va be har hal ye kar-e mosharekati ro dashte bashid? ‘Couldn’t you find any other partner to do group work possibly?’ rather than extending the time, while in pair 18, the student himself reframed the extension into the alternative vali nemidoonam hala hich rahi hast ke man ba daneshjooohay-e dige baham poroje erae bedim ya masalan ye rahkari ke man betoonam? ‘I don’t know if is there any way that I can do a group project with other students or for example, [is there] any other alternative that I can?’ (turn 17, Excerpt 5.14). The participants have almost no way of resolving these issues and making decisions without questions.

Much of this analysis depends on a different understanding of request than employed in the speech act approach of Chapter 4. From that perspective, arguably, the request is just the initial question from the student about an extension, the next turn is the response, and the rest is a conversation about the request, but is not the request itself. This approach is reasonable, but it does have its limitations. None of the conversations ended after that initial response. If a
request requires a response from the requestee, it was often not until many turns later that the final response was given (see also section 5.3.5). Between the initial request and the final decision, the request was frequently modified by both requester and requestee in ways that neither knew would happen when the request started. From this perspective, then, the request is a lengthy conversational accomplishment, not one turn\(^\text{11}\).

### 5.3.6 Closing the Request Conversation

The participants seem to know when to end the conversation. But, how did both speakers decide the task has been accomplished? Almost always, the students were the ones to move to end the conversation as they were the starter. Clark (1996) pointed out that participants must mutually agree to exit the conversation and coordinate their actual disengagement. There is some point where both speakers realise they are done, agree they have determined the request, and move to goodbyes. The joint task is accomplished either when a request, in some form, is granted or the student’s attempt to get the extension failed. In other words, when the final determination is made, the participants are often ready to quit the conversation. They say farewells at this point.

When joint or independent commitment is done for future action, the task approaches closing. The conversations move to thanking or apologizing for taking the time and then making farewells. For 5 of the 18 pairs--pairs 3, 17 (all speakers with high SE), 18 (speaker with high SE, addressee with low SE), and pairs 11 and 12 (all speakers with low SE)--the participants did not close the conversation immediately after the final decision was reached and proposed other topics relevant to the project like ‘Would not it [this extra extension] affect my final score?’, ‘When will our final exam results be ready?’, and ‘Would I have to type the project or a handwritten one be accepted?’

The range of turns taken to end the conversations are between 2 to 10. Excerpt 5.16 shows one ending sample in pair 11 (both speakers with low SE). Note that thanking and appreciation are repeated more than once (see also Chang & Haugh, 2011).

\(^{11}\) The premise of this chapter is that requests can be viewed both as single speech acts and as conversational accomplishments. Terminology to distinguish these two perspectives may be necessary, rather than using request for both; however, that is left for future work.
Putting it all together, we can ask: “What would a speaker need to know to successfully participate in a request conversation in Persian?” We have a partial answer from this look at requests as conversations. Participants will need to be able to initiate the conversation, give reasons justifying their request, make sure to emphasise that they are working on something both speakers care about, determine what the request will be in exact detail with their
conversation partner, and determine what actions will be accepted or rejected. Finally, once these items are determined, the conversation can be ended.

As can be seen in many of the excerpts presented in this chapter, the student may have initiated the request question, but the professors asked far more questions in the conversations. It seems that professors know their role is to ask why this extension is being asked for; such questions came as no surprise for students. These questions from the requestee, with responses from the requester, were a main way that the conversation was guided. This implies that the one being asked was at least as responsible for accomplishing the request conversation as the one asking. That is one part of the knowledge the participants have to know in order to successfully participate in request conversation in Persian.

The speakers used the conversation to create new goals by reframing requests, which involved more than the request itself. Reframing requests often added evaluative aspects that went beyond when the project would be submitted. Reframed requests involved evaluating the worthiness of the reasons for the request, the worthiness of the requester as a student, and the worthiness of the project’s quality and relevance. The request, therefore, is treated as a joint activity in which the participants used the accomplishments of the conversation to achieve things in life. When the task is accomplished jointly, the participants are often ready to end the conversation.

This approach to request conversations—treating them as conversations—is complementary to a speech act analysis. Such an approach misses findings that speech act analysis uncovers, as it does not look at the same granular level. At the same time, the new approach reveals some of the broader reasons for granular choices, such as the specific form of a request resulting not from a social variable but in direct response to a previous turn. All together, this analysis searches for the common patterns and sets of knowledge required if one wishes to interact competently in a request.
CHAPTER 6
PARTICIPANTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF REQUEST CONVERSATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the qualitative analysis of how participants themselves think about their own request conversations based upon interviews with them (see also Grainger & Mills, 2016; van der Bom & Mills, 2015; see also section 2.3.1.3). The speech act analysis can only capture what the Trosborg (1995) system is designed to capture. In particular, it focuses upon the forms of requests which could add to the understanding of common structures used in Persian dialogues. However, this may miss recurring important notions from the participants themselves involved in the task. Chapter 5 was a researcher-oriented study of request conversations as joint activities. This chapter aims to identify important principle patterns in how the participants viewed their own conversations. The chapter includes the coding procedure for the simulated recall interview data as well as an analysis of how the participants reflected on their request choices across four different Persian contexts (Chapter 4 did the same, while Chapter 5 looked only at the Professor-Extension (+P+D) context). This chapter aims to answer the last research question, ‘Why are particular request choices made in different academic Persian situations? What are the reasons?’ A qualitative analysis was conducted for the interview data including both speakers’ and addressees’ comments. The analysis procedure includes the transcription and coding sections. The findings that emerged from the data included taarof, pride, humility, giving the addressee an option, attitude, academic face, social rights and moral obligations, power, relationship and imposition. The Persian scripts of data examples in each of these sections are romanised and translated for the ease of study.

6.2 QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Interview data consisted of the transcribed answers to the four questions (Appendix G; see section 3.4.2) in each of the four different educational settings from 36 Persians, a total of almost 11 hours in length. Interview data were rich, as participants not only directly answered
questions, but also spontaneously elaborated on their answers with personal remarks, including general observations about their role play performances and Persian politeness (*adab*) in light of their personal experiences of and beliefs about Persian culture and society.

For the interview data, a broad transcription for content was used with punctuation conventions like comma, period and question marks. The content included the entire transcription of individuals’ comments. There was less focus on smaller and larger pauses, overlapping and incomplete speech unless they were involved in determining the ideas generally. The interview transcription also included the researcher’s further questions between discussions. The personal remarks and general observations about their role play performances were also transcribed entirely and coded. The entire interview transcription process took over 60 hours. An example of transcription of one of the participants’ answers to the first interview question in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario is presented in Appendix H.

The analysis of interview data focuses on reasons for both the request choices used in the role plays by the speakers and the choices suggested in the interview by both the speakers and the addressees as presented in section 4.6. Inductive content analysis is applied to identify themes and develop theory by studying the interview recordings.

The process of generating theory from data based on the interview transcripts began with coding through MAXQDA software. The analysis developed with inductive or bottom-up coding, i.e., starting with the text itself. The bottom-up phase began by reading and rereading the transcripts of sessions carefully, and identifying segments of relevant texts, i.e. words and phrases that were relevant to the study’s focus. In this case, relevant texts would be any text that refers to either participant’s role plays, their choices or their real life experiences.

At the first level of coding, ideas that are relevant to the aims of the study, such as expectations about and reasons for politeness choices were identified. At the second level of coding, recurrent or related ideas were grouped into general themes. In other words, after identifying the ideas at a detailed level, those ideas which repeated were grouped into themes representing the more general ideas that are implicit in the repeated detailed ideas. Below shows a part of the analysis of one of the speakers’ answer to the first interview question in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario.

- آره، جون حق با اوونه عملال و زمانی که گذشتید به دقت گذشتید. و اوتارجری نیستش که من بخواهم حالا طلیکار باشم یا لحنم تندتر بکنم طبق قانون و قاعدش باید اون تاریخ میسرتومن و تمام می شد حالا میدوام ازش به امتیازه اضافه نه بگیرم پس باید ازش خواهم بکنم حالا میتونه یا یا قبول میتوونه یا نه قبول، حتی اگر قبول نکنه همی یا همی نمیتونم لحنم تغییر بدم یا چیز دیگه ای یا گم. فقط الان دارم خواهم میکنم که لطفی بکنه. حالا
وقتو بیشتر بده. به خاطر همین لحن در اینجا بود. اونانی که ترکیب زحمت داره اصلا نه، جون اون عمل
کاری نمیکنه فقط اش میخواهین که وقت بیشتر بده. "میشه خواهش کنم؟" معمولی‌نه.


- Yes [I do], because he was certainly right. And the deadline he set up has been passed. And it was not like that I wanted to ask for my right or to use a serious tone of voice. I should have given my project at the due time based on the course schedule. Now I’m gonna get an extra bonus [i.e., get an extension] so I must request him to do so. It was his choice to accept or reject it. If he didn’t accept it, I couldn’t yet change my tone of voice or say anything else. I was just requesting him to do me a favour to extend the time. For that reason my tone was like that. I’d never use those request strategies with the combination ‘bothering/trouble’ [i.e., ‘if no trouble,…’ or ‘do this trouble…’] because the professor would almost do nothing. We only wanted him to give more time. ‘Would it be possible to request you?’ is more common.

At the lower level of coding, the sentences underlined talked about a professor’s rights and choices. They were coded into a professor domain. The transcriptions given in bold refer to the student’s mistake and responsibilities. At the higher level of coding, the underlined sentences represent professor’s power and the bold sentences refer to social rights and moral obligations. These more general themes were implicit in the initially identified segments and were categorised under theoretical concepts. Additional statements by others on power (6.2.2.1) or obligations (6.2.2.2) would then solidify this coding as relevant for the participants.

(6.2.2.1)
1. ehsasam in-e ke kheyli ekhtelaf-e mogheiyyat-e ejtemaei hast too in mogheiyyat. My sense is that there is social hierarchy in this context.

2. bara inke khodetoon ro dar halat-e paeintar gharar bedin ke ostad befahme ke ye ghodrati dare. Because you should position yourself lower than the professor that he realises he has power.

(6.2.2.2)
1. kari ro dorost anjam nadadam. Kambood va ghosoor az janab-e man boode.
I didn’t complete my work. The faulty and negligence was from my side.

2. chon ye eshtebahi khodam kardam dige.
Because I myself made a mistake.

The findings that emerged from this interview data analysis, i.e. themes, are discussed in detail in the following sections.

6.3 FINDINGS

Through the thematic analysis, different emic concepts were identified through interview questions. Ten main ideas emerged:

1. Taarof
2. Pride
3. Humility
4. Giving the addressee an option
5. Attitude
6. Academic face
7. Social rights and moral obligations
8. Power
9. Relationship
10. Imposition

Of 15 themes, 10 ideas are discussed in the current study. They are not in a strict sequence; however, they are not completely separate ideas. In the interviews, different individual, social and culture variables were commented upon, but some of them have been unresolved in previous studies. The first wave politeness literature suggests that social power, distance and imposition are all that is needed to understand politeness, but that does not appear to be true in adab (Persian first-order politeness) as the speakers thought about other factors such as attitude and pride as well when deciding how to express their request in different contexts.
To attest the cultural theoretical constructs, a connection between the data and *adab* is created. Each of the sections consists of relevant codes followed by the participants’ further explanations. The sections are categorised based on what the participants shared about their views on each scenario in the interviews. The following section looks at how *taarof* (see section 2.4) works in the different contexts.

### 6.3.1 Taarof

Brown and Levinson’s (1987) first wave politeness model used social power, distance and imposition as universal aspects of politeness. One culturally-specific principle that the participants identified was *taarof*. *Taarof* is often seen as a foundational principle of Persian social relationships and politeness (Beeman, 1976, 1986; Mir-Djalali, 1992; Koutlaki, 2002, Izadi, 2016; see also section 2.4). We then would predict that Persian speakers would discuss *taarof* when asked about polite requests. Indeed, when discussing the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, Speaker 7 (high SE, mild indirect) stated *ma ghashang taarofi hastim* ‘we [Iranians] are totally *taarofi*.’ Despite this claim, only three participants claimed that they should practise *taarof* in the conversation. In the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, Addressee 4 (high SE, possibility) claimed he would respect, appreciate and compliment his departmental manager for the purpose of *taarof* (6.3.1.1).

(6.3.1.1, Addressee 4, high SE)

> *dorost-e chon taraf maghami nadare vali mitoone choob la charkhet bezare. Ehsas nakone ke chon vazifash-e be man hatman javab bede. Va vaghti dare behem mohabat mikone, man behesh ehteram bezaram va ghadrdani konam mogheiyyatesho. Va ‘mitoonam az tajrobiyateton estefade konam,’ bishtar taarof bood.*

That’s right [that] his social position is not high but he could have delayed the process. He shouldn’t feel it was his duty to answer me. And, when he is kind to me, I would respect him and also appreciate his effort. And ‘I can use your experiences’ would be more *taarof*.

Complimenting, appreciating and thanking are common *taarof* practices in academic junior-senior relationships. They might have different functions but generally create a situation to get positive feedback. Speaker 5 (low SE, possibility) stated he would end a conversation with the manager with *taarof*, using a phrase such as *ishala jobran konim baraton* ‘I hope I compensate
it for you.’ Speaker 5 explains that this would be appropriate for his culture and to display *adab* (6.3.1.2).

(6.3.1.2, Speaker 5, low SE)

\[
\text{akhlagham ast va nakhodagah-e farhang-e. Nahayat-e adab-e. Goftanesh khali az lotf nist.}
\]

It’s my type and also our culture. It’s ultimately displaying *adab* (Persian politeness). It is worthy to say such.

Claims to show *taarof* at the end of a conversation (6.3.1.2) or with appreciation and compliments (6.3.1.1) would mostly affect frequency of external supportive moves.

While only these two participants spontaneously claimed they would practise *taarof*, this does not mean that *taarof* was not on the minds of participants when performing the role play or discussing them in the interviews. Indeed, several participants, including the one who claimed that ‘we [Iranians] are totally *taarofi’ discussed how the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario was not a place to practise *taarof*, which was critical for how they chose to express themselves. This result is somewhat different from what Izadi (2016) discussed on *taarof* as people in the data claimed that practicing *taarof* does not fit into this friendly prompt. It seems that both the interaction of the degree of closeness and the topic of request are important in using *taarof* as it might bring about distance between friends.

Participants indicate that the close friendship is critical in the choice not to practise *taarof*. *Taarof* generally refers to strong insistence on offers and refusals in Persian culture (Koutlaki, 2002). This would suggest that requesting or lending money would come with a strong practice of *taarof*; however, the nature of friendship changes this (6.3.1.3).

(6.3.1.3, Speaker 6, high SE)

\[
\]

There is some kind of impure elements in *taarof*. Something bad, inappropriate or improper comes with *taarof* [if people don’t practice *taarof*, it’s bad, inappropriate or improper]. And, our request would never be imperative, we would instead use plain (neutral) language. I have many close friends but am not very close with all of them. The level of closeness is very important.
Practicing *taarof* can indicate hiding truth or criticism because speaking frankly is not well-accepted in Iranian society; however, when friendship is close, frankness is to be valued and not covered over with *taarof*. Addressee 6 (high SE, mild indirect), Speaker 6’s conversation partner, makes the relationship between close friends and a lack of *taarof* clear (6.3.1.4).

(6.3.1.4, Addressee 6, high SE)


There is never *taarof* in close relationships. However, there are different layers with close friends in which some reasons or wording are said before making a request with some of them, but the request is made comfortably with some other close friends. However, there is a kind loyalty/faithfulness in *taarof*. In close relationships, friends will become one which means they have no *taarof* with each other. In other way, a friend is ready to accept an outstanding payment for his friend just to help him and to sort out his problem.

As Addressee 6 states, friends are as one and have no *taarof* with each other. Other participants use similar language about there being no *taarof* with a close friend (6.3.1.5).

(6.3.1.5, Addressee 7, high SE)

> chon doost-e samimim hast, na steres daram na bahash taarof daram vaghti darkhast daram. Say nemikonam azash kheyli rasmi beporsam. Na amikhte ba ehsas-e tarahom hast, na amikhte ba rasmi.

Because he is my close friend, I am not nervous and also have no *taarof* with him to ask my request. I wouldn’t try to ask him formally. Not mixed with feelings of pity, not with formal wording.

Note that *taarof* is not just about the social or ethical principle motivating but is stated by the participants to affect language choices. Addressee 6 (high SE, mild indirect) adds that he would not use formal language because there is no *taarof*, while Addressee 8 (high SE, ability) states that applying a *taarof* sort of phrase can put pressure between friends and must be met with *taarof* (6.3.1.6).

I would not have such expectations even from my closest friend. ‘You are my only close friend’ uses as a means of pressure on me to get a ‘yes’ answer. Because we are close friends so no need to say that. I used taarof to cover my negative answer. I said ‘don’t mention it’ [in a case I had given money to him] as I did not want to give money. Otherwise, I would not have said ‘don’t mention it.’

Addressee 8 felt that it is inappropriate that the speaker highlighted the friendship, as it adds pressure on the friendship. When the addressee declined to lend the money, he wished to keep things light and so added ghabel-e to ro nadare ‘don’t mention it’ to show that it would be no big deal if he had money to lend. This was an act of taarof created by a possible tension in the friendship by refusing the request, but it is best not to get into such a situation if possible. It is important to minimise taarof in order not to put pressure on the friend (see also Izadi, 2016), either in asking the friend for money or in getting the friend a positive response. It can help maintain the existing friendship (6.3.1.7).

yani vaghti doost-e samimi-e, adam mostaghim harfesho mizane va mige taarof baham nadarim. Nemikham dostimoon..., nemikham dar dardesar biyofti.
It means when I ask my need directly from a close friend, I emphasise we have no taarof with each other. I don’t want our friendship…I don’t want you to be in trouble.

Every participant discussing taarof then has also discussed the fact that this is a close friendship, and that fact must be considered when expressing the request. Participants in (6.3.1.6) and (6.3.1.7) focus upon the fact that one should not pressure or trouble a friend. This is also echoed by Speaker 7 (high SE, strong indirect) (6.3.1.8).
(6.3.1.8, Speaker 7, high SE)


I tried my best until the end of the conversation to show him we’re close friends and there is no pressure. And, do think about my request that if you need your money, feel no pressure. I did not want my friend to be in *rudarbayesti.*

*Rudarbayesti* represents shyness and lack of comfort to refuse or give a negative response to offers, requests or invitations (see also Izadi, 2016; Sharifian & Babaie, 2013; see section 2.4). Being in *rudarbayesti* is the result of this pressure in which his friend might feel uncomfortable and can hardly reject what he cannot afford and so he tried to avoid this.

All examples so far but one (6.3.1.2) are from a high self-esteem participant. Indeed, of the participants mentioning *taarof* directly in their interviews, six were of high self-esteem and two of low. The high self-esteem participants tended to provide the request and state they would take any refusal lightly without pursuing the matter further. Addressee 8 (high SE) suggested an ability choice for the request form in the interview (not in the role play): *haji, mitooni masalan inkaro bokoni?* ‘Haji (my friend), can you do that for me?’ He claimed that he would not expect his friend, even the closest one, to meet his need. This participant is also the one who thought that referring to friendship in the request added inappropriate pressure (6.3.1.6). Addressee 4 (high SE) took a similar view indicating he would make the request very directly (6.3.1.9).

(6.3.1.9, Addressee 4, high SE)

*ESM, ye pooli beriz be hesab-e man hamin alan.*

FIRST NAME, send some money to my account right now.

This is not a rude request from Addressee 4’s point of view as his goal is not to claim *taarof* with his close friend. Similarly, he claimed that he would be happy even if the request were unsuccessful (6.3.1.10).
For addressee 4 (high SE), both the request and the response can be direct as they are close friends and do not have taarof.

The low self-esteem speakers who mentioned taarof acted somewhat differently. Speaker 8 (low SE, possibility) explained to the addressee that the speaker could not find anyone closer in friendship than the addressee, which is why he has approached this friend. He would also make clear to his friend not to do taarof if it was not possible for the friend to lend money. However, he further said that in friendship, he would expect his friends to help him when he is in need (6.3.1.11).

Addressee 11 (low SE) suggested an ability choice in the interview (not in the role play) (6.3.1.12).

Similar to the last speaker, Speaker 8, who emphasised the close friendship, Addressee 11 indicated the importance of the matter, indicating it is a matter of survival. After he made his example, he also emphasised that he would add age nadari, hich chizi nista...aslan hich masale-ei nista ‘if you don’t have it..., no problem at all’ immediately. This mitigation phrase avoids pressure on the addressee to fulfil the request. High self-esteem speakers then focus upon the casualness of the request, due to close friendship. The low self-esteem speakers,
while agreeing that they should not pressure or burden their friend, emphasise the special nature of their friendship in handling this important matter. Izadi, in line with Locher (2004, p. 90), argues that over-polite acts may be viewed negatively. To speak casually, the high self-esteem participants’ requests can have a feeling of ‘whatever’ to shelter their friend, while the low self-esteem speakers’ requests emphasise the special nature of the friendship.

Participants did not mention taarof when discussing both Professor-Extension (+P+D) and Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenarios. The former may be because common conventional hierarchical situations do not allow a mutual practice of taarof or hiding criticism to maintain politeness. The latter may be because there is no substantial relationship to maintain and protect. Despite the rather limited reference to taarof in all four scenarios, the discussion by participants indicates an awareness of taarof in making decisions about the form of requests. As Speaker 7 (high SE) stated: ma ghashang taarofi hastim’ ‘we [Iranians] are totally taarofi’.

6.3.2 Pride

Pride is one of the cultural factors discussed in the interviews. Also, the Oxford dictionary’s definition of pride is “a feeling or deep pleasure or satisfaction derived from one’s own achievements.” In Persian academic, social and interpersonal relationships, problems or needs should be asked or negotiated in a way so as not to hurt or break individuals’ pride. We then would predict that Persian speakers would discuss pride when powerlessness, inability or a necessity in asking for a favour happened. Indeed, when discussing the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, one speaker with high self-esteem expressed that requesting money would make him destroyed completely in real life (6.3.2.1).

(6.3.2.1, Speaker 2, high SE)

This scenario is never my favourite. I haven’t borrowed money from my dad. It is difficult to imagine this situation. It is terrible for me to borrow money from someone. I would withdraw [from the college] and not get money.

It was also very difficult for him to make an alternative request choice in the interview. He added that he would use a request strategy and wording that does not bring him down; the
ability strategy was his choice in this prompt (6.3.2.2). He preferred to not make the request to keep his pride safe, although he made it just for the sake of the role play.

(6.3.2.2, Speaker 2, high SE)

_to mitooni ye chand roozi behem gharz bedi polo, man chiz konam?_
Can you lend me this money for a couple of days, I do [pay my charges]?

The request topic in this prompt seemed to attack one’s strength and subsequently men’s pride, therefore asking for money is difficult for Persian men. As Speaker 10 (low SE) expressed (6.3.2.3).

(6.3.2.3, Speaker 10, low SE)


I am hypersensitive to [and struggle with] asking for money. Even when I was a kid, it was difficult for me to get money from my dad. Maybe if I wanted to borrow my friend’s car, it would have been easier. But I am not a person to borrow anything from people; it is difficult for me. My tone of voice was low [in the role play] because it was a weak/negative point for me. I think it’s Iranian pride, Persian men’s pride. I have never done it; that’s why I played with words to make it (the request). I was a kid and wanted to ask for money from my dad. It was a nightmare because it might have damaged the friendship relationship.

Other participants similarly claimed that they prepared the context for their request because of men’s pride. Through preparation, speakers might find out if their friend is willing to lend money or their request would comply with their friend’s situation, and it can then save men’s pride. Speaker 11 (low SE, possibility) commented on preparation as to approach his request. He also noted that asking for money depends on the friendship history (6.3.2.4).

(6.3.2.4, Speaker 11, low SE)

_in sakhtarin lahze-ye oomr-e adam-e. Man kheyli kheyli sakhtam-e ke bekham az kesi pool gharz konam. Vali kheyli bastegi dare be rabete-ei ke ba doost-e samimim daram. Ye zarre avval ye moghadamechini mikonam be khater-e oon ghoroor-e mardoone._

This is the most difficult moment of my life. It is terribly difficult for me to borrow money from someone. However, it depends on the relationship that I have with my close friend. To start, I prepared the context a little bit because of male pride.
In discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Addressee 5 (low SE, possibility) commented that adding the prepositional phrase with first person pronoun *dar hagh-e man* ‘in my rights/for my sake’ in his request example would express inferiority and also hurt his pride. Instead, he suggested a possibility choice *aya maghdoor ast baratoon ke inkaro anjam bedin?* ‘Would it be possible for you to do this?’ in the interview excluding that phrase. To him, this phrase *dar hagh-e man* ‘for my sake’ can show a high level of misery. Inferiority can be perceived. This addressee was the only person who talked about pride in this hierarchical situation.

Participants did not mention pride when discussing the other two scenarios Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) and the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D). The former may be because the request topic is more casual and also the distant relationship cannot hurt pride very much. The latter may also be because the request topic is not very demanding and the manager is the right person to answer students’ inquiries.

### 6.3.3 Humility

Participants also discussed the role of humility in their choices. When discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Speaker 3 (high SE, possibility) commented that being humble can increase the chance of acceptance; however, he differentiated between being humble and begging, which is not pleasant in such situations (6.3.3.1). He further explained that using ‘no trouble’ strategies, such as *bi zahmat mishe be man bishtar mohlat bedin?* ‘no trouble, would it be possible to give me an extension?’ are a bit offensive in a hierarchical situation as it included *bi zahmat* ‘no trouble’ which might be considered as ordering.

(6.3.3.1, Speaker 3, high SE)

> *say mikonam ta jaei ke momken-e kochik be bozorg, yani selsele maratebi bashe. Yani kheyli motevazeane begam chon be nazar miyad to iran intori begim, emkanesh hast pazirofte beshe. Bekham ziyad zari konam doost nadare ta jaei ke iran ro mishnasam. I tried to use strategies showing hierarchical position from inferior to superior as much as possible. It meant I requested with modesty because it seems [that] the possibility request strategy is possible to be accepted in Iran. As far as I know Iranian contexts, [if] I show my misery very much, he doesn’t like it.*

Modesty generally has a positive meaning and is appreciated in Iranian academia. The above comment was also confirmed by Speaker 4 (high SE, possibility). He justified being *motavaze* ‘humble’ when talking to professors with his mistake and noticed this works out in Persian contexts (6.3.3.2).
(6.3.3.2, Speaker 4, high SE)
age to mogheiyyati basham ke to moze zaf hastam va ya kari ro dorost anjam nadadam, kambod va ghosoor az janeb-e man boode, say mikonam motavaze basham va janeb-e ehtiyato raayat konam. If I were in a situation in which I made a mistake, and deficiency and failure were on my part, I’d try to be humble and cautious.

Addressee 15’s (low SE) comment is that he learnt to khod ra paein biyar-e ‘lower himself’ before a professor. In his direct request in the interview (not in the role play), he suggested the highly hierarchical verb bozorgavari farmaeid ‘have mercy on me.’ In his role play, he also left his sentence incomplete which could mean asking the professor’s generosity to accept his request (6.3.3.3).

(6.3.3.3, Addressee 15, low SE)
to farhang-e iran, daneshjoo bayad ye kam bezane too sar-e khodesh va khodesh ro bekeshe paein va ebraz-e ajzo bicharegi kone. Farhangemoon injoori-e. In Persian culture, a student should lower himself and express his inability and misery. Our culture is like that.

Addressee 3 (low SE) mentioned that if he knew the professor, it would have been easy for the student to lower himself than the professor. His possibility choice in the interview (not in the role play) included a hierarchical phrase lotfi dar hagham konin ‘do me a favour’ which can show his misery. This term dar hagham ‘for my sake’ contains a higher meaning than baray-e man ‘for me’ which expressed the speaker lowered himself, while Addressee 5 (low SE, possibility) emphasised that he would not use this term dar hagham ‘for me’ to lower himself to save his pride as discussed in 6.3.2. However, Addressee 9 (low SE, possibility) said that he would not lower his voice, but he also claimed, as giving an extension is a big favour, he would use dar hagh-e man ‘for my sake’ in his request choice (6.3.3.4).

(6.3.3.4, Addressee 9, low SE)
hatto ton-e sedam ro say nemikonam kheyli paein biyaram. Albate mozoo-e darkhast mohemm-e chon gharar-e ye lotfi dar hagh-e adam beshe ke kharej az oon chargeboob hast va gharar-e mohlat dade beshe va gharar-e estesna ghael beshe ostad. Even I wouldn’t try to lower my tone of voice very much. However, the type of request is really important because the professor would do a big favour for me which is out of the discipline. He would give an extension and make an exception for me.
In the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, both speakers with high self-esteem (6.3.3.1) and (6.3.3.2) focused on hierarchical status in Iran, where juniors have to make sure they request with modesty, particularly if the mistake is on their side; however, begging would not be appropriate. They meant that a moderate level of humility is appreciated in senior-junior relationships in Iranian society, while the addressees with low self-esteem, (6.3.3.3) and (6.3.3.4), focused on lowering themselves down when requesting the professor who would do a big favour *dar haghshan* ‘for their sake’. In other words, the low self-esteem group displayed humility through lowering their position, while the high self-esteem speakers emphasised the modesty of their request form, not themselves.

In the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario, rejecting the request, or further questions on the time of returning the class notes, can happen due to unfamiliarity between the speakers. Showing humility or being modest when making this request might work out. Speaker 2 (high SE, ability) focused on using apology expressions because he believed that it showed a lowering of his position so that the classmate would not reject the speaker’s request. One of his apologies was *faghat ye chizi ke hast ba arz-e sharmandegi man in jozveha ro nadaram* ‘the only thing is that, with a shame, I don’t have the class notes’ before his request (6.3.3.5). It can show he approached the request through modesty.

(6.3.3.5, Speaker 2, high SE)


I would use words such as ‘sorry’ or ‘it’s a shame’. This can show it is the time to put myself a level lower than him to make him ready not to become guarded. Opening discussion is for asking my request but I don’t praise him too much.

Similarly, Speaker 3 (high SE, ability) believed that he had to be polite and request with modesty in Persian contexts; however, his emphasis was on talking to his classmate in an equal manner (6.3.3.6). To him requesting with modesty meant not to be demanding, not to expect positive answer and not to order.

(6.3.3.6, Speaker 3, high SE)

*kheyli mosavi yani movazi bahash sohbat mikonam. Darkhastamo moadabane migam va to mohit-e iran bayad hama ro motevazeane goft.*

I’d talk to him equally. I’d request him politely and any request in Persian contexts should be made modestly.
To Speaker 4 (high SE, possibility) lending class notes is not a big favour and he would not use wording suggesting it was (6.3.3.7).

(6.3.3.7, Speaker 4, high SE)

jozve gereftan lotf bozorgi nist ke bekham jori azash darkhast konam ke zir-e menatesh basham.

Asking for a class note is not a big favour and I don’t want to request as if I’d owe him.

The style of request is important for being modest. Addressee 3 (low SE) suggested a possibility choice in the interview (not in the role play) mishe azat chizi bekham? ‘Would it be possible to ask you something?’ in which mishe? is an informal form of ‘possible?’ He commented that because he does not know his classmate and their status is also equal, he would not put himself lower than his classmate for such requests. However, he added that if the request is demanding, he would position himself lower than his classmate a bit (6.3.3.8).

(6.3.3.8, Addressee 3, low SE)

vaghti kesio nashnasam, kheyli khodamo nemiyaram paein chon sathemoon yekist. Albate darkhast mohemm-e. Age darkhast kheyli bozorg bashe, bayad ye zarre biyam paein.

When I don’t know a person, I don’t lower myself much because our level is equal. Of course, the type of request is important. If a request would be demanding, I would have to put myself lower than him a bit.

All examples so far but one (6.3.3.8) are from high self-esteem group. However, they viewed humility differently. Speaker 2 (6.3.3.5) believed that he had to lower himself by using apology expressions for asking his classmate, while Speaker 3 (6.3.3.6) viewed modesty through speaking politely with his classmates but not lowering himself. Also, Speaker 4 (6.3.3.7) believed that borrowing a class note was not a big favour and the requestive wording should not show he owed someone. In this regard, Addressee 3 (6.3.3.8) and Speaker 3 (6.3.3.6) had the same idea on modesty that they would not lower himself in an equal position, but if the request topic is demanding, they would do so. A different result on self-esteem was found only in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario where the low self-esteem group displayed humility through lowering their position, while the high self-esteem speakers emphasised the modesty of their request form, not themselves.

Participants did not mention modesty when discussing the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario or the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario. The former can be because there is substantial friendship which helped individuals not to practice modesty. A
similar reason may also be for the latter, although the closeness is not at the same degree. The
discussion of modesty by participants indicates they are aware of applying it or not in their
requests in different situations. As Addressee 5 (low SE, possibility) talked about, the
Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario is a familiar situation in which he did not
need to lower himself. Close relations had a main role in this context (6.3.3.9).

(6.3.3.9, Addressee 5, low SE)

chon ye chizi beyn-e in halat-e doosti va on halat-e ostad-e. Chon niaz nadari khodeto
biyari paein. Gheir az moaddabane, ye kalamati ro be kar bebari ke asar gozar bashe.
Because this prompt described a situation which is between a friendly relationship [the
Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario] and professor relationship [the Professor-
Extension (+P+D) scenario]. You don’t need to lower yourself. Except behave politely,
wording should be used which is effective.

6.3.4 Giving the Addressee an Option

Another concept that frequently arose from the interviews was communicating to the addressee
that they had the option to fulfill the request or not. In the Classmates-Borrowing Notes
(−P+D) scenario, the scenario card described that the addressee was chosen by chance with no
close relationship, so asking for class notes might not make the situation uncomfortable and
giving the addressee an option could work out. Speaker 4 (high SE) believed that the
possibility request strategy gives an option to his interlocutor if his request did not wish to
comply. The requestee could feel free to say ‘no’ if it is demanding or is not affordable. He felt
that giving the addressee an option made him more polite because he did not know his
classmate (6.3.4.1).

(6.3.4.1, Speaker 4, high SE)

are khob be nazar miyad ke alan moadabtar-e chon nemishnasamesh. Va inke ye chiz-e
dige-ei ham ke hast ke ye gozine-ei be taraf bedam ke age nemitone inkaro bokone,
eshkali nadare. Yani nemikham tarafo ziyad taht-e feshar bezaram. Man hamishe vaghti
mikham ye darkhasti bokonam ye gozine-ei be taraf midam ke age emkan nadare, eshkali
nadare.

Well it seemed this [strategy] was now more polite because I didn’t know him. And there
is one more thing that I gave an option to him if he couldn’t do it, it would’ve been okay.
In other words, I didn’t want to put pressure on the addressee. Generally when I want to
request, I’d give an option to my interlocutor that if it’s not possible, it’s okay.

Speaker 15 (high SE, possibility) had the same idea to give his classmate an option (6.3.4.2).
His concern might be not to put pressure on someone to get his needs met.
Another example is Speaker 9 (low SE) whose choice was a permission strategy *hala mishe kopi [begiram]? ‘Well, [would it be] possible to photocopy?’ Although he used ‘would it be possible?’ in his request, pragmatically he was asking permission to borrow the class notes. In the interview, he claimed that he used this strategy to give an option to his interlocutor who was unfamiliar (6.3.4.3).

(6.3.4.3, Speaker 9, low SE)

*are, chon age taraf ro nashnasam. Va mikham gozine bedam be taraf.*

Yes, because I didn’t know the interlocutor. I also want[ed] to give an option to him.

The above comments show the request choices providing an option are to give freedom to reject the request.

In the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, requests such as asking for money can be demanding, although it depends on how much money has been asked for. Therefore, giving the addressee an option is a means that people often use in their request conversation; however, indirect hints was the most frequent request strategy that the participants used. For example, Speaker 7 (high SE) made a strong indirect hint for his choice (6.3.4.4).

(6.3.4.4, Speaker 7, high SE)

*mikhastam bebinam age moshkeli nist bibinam chetori-ye vazeiyat.*

I wondered if there is no problem to see how your [financial] status is.

He explained that his friend already told him to call him if he was in need. However, the speaker used cost minimizing strategies, an external supportive move type, such as *motmaen basham? ‘Are you sure?’* and *taarof nadarim ‘we don’t have taarof’* multiple times in the role play so that there was no pressure to accept the request if it did not comply with his friend’s condition (6.3.4.5). The requester wanted to avoid his friend being in *rudarbayesti* which could be one consequence of this *taarof*-like context (see also section 2.4). An indirect strong hint could give an option and let his close friend be free to decide.
Interestingly, speaker 4 (high SE, ability) did not use a possibility strategy, although he claimed that he gave options to his close friend to feel free to say ‘no.’ He added that it also depends on how much the speaker knows his friend. The requester also used a cost minimizing modification *khoob hast barat?* ‘Is that okay for you?’ which might indicate freedom to his friend (6.3.4.6).

(Borrowing money is demanding on a friendship and has the potential to threaten friends’ ability. In this regard, Speaker 15 (high SE, possibility) gave the option to his friend with the possibility strategy (6.3.4.7). Similar to the other above high self-esteem speakers, he also used a cost minimizing strategy to give an option to the addressee.

By looking at the role plays in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, it is interesting that claims of giving the addressee options by speaker 12 (low SE), speaker 4 (6.3.4.6, high SE) and speaker 15 (6.3.4.7, high SE) show that it was not limited to request head acts but also through cost minimizing.

Giving options was also discussed in the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, as Addressee 12 (low SE, possibility) explained that he should use a strategy which gives freedom to the departmental manager, because, if the request cannot be met, then there...
would be a misunderstanding that the departmental manager did not want to provide the research grant. This participant suggested that it would be better to meet the manager to ask for suggestions. Addressee 12 equated giving the addressee an option with seeking suggestions which does not create a threat to the addressee’s freedom (6.3.4.8).

(6.3.4.8, Addressee 12, low SE)


If we actually know that this process isn’t under the control of the departmental manager, it means we are aware that he is limited when we’re going to his office. We’re going to ask for suggestions. It means that we’re doubtful and going to only ask. If we say ‘please do a favour’, it means ‘sign it for us’ which means ‘it’s in your hand’ and ‘if he doesn’t do it’ means ‘you didn’t sign it for us.’ But the ‘no trouble’ phrase means ‘we want to know about the status of our application, and give us [some] suggestions.’

Claims of giving the friends options, such as by speaker 12 (low SE), speaker 4 (6.3.4.6, high SE) and speaker 15 (6.3.4.7, high SE), show that it was not limited to request head acts but also through cost minimizing. Addressee 12 (6.3.4.8, low SE) believed that giving the addressee an option in the +Power but –Distance prompt equals seeking a suggestion, indicating a trivial threat to the addressee’s freedom. Even though no one talked about this idea in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) situation, the conventionally indirect ‘possibility’ request was still the most frequent choice in it (see section 4.4.3). The emic understandings on giving the addressee an option showed that it could appear in other forms than request head acts such as external supportive moves.

### 6.3.5 Attitude

The addressee’s attitude was also highlighted as important for determining the form of request. Indeed, when discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Addressee 1 (high SE, possibility) pointed out that asking for the extension from a professor was subject to the professor’s attitude at the start. If a professor looks serious or tough, he would leave his office (6.3.5.1).
Addressee 6 (high SE, possibility) commented that the professor’s attitude can affect his request wording. He also already talked about the influence of age in his strategy, but he did not skip attitude (6.3.5.2).

(6.3.5.2, Addressee 6, high SE)

tooy-e farhang-e irani, ma hamishe sen ro madd-e nazar gharar midim. Vali khob bazam barmigarde be noo-e raftar va shakhsiyyat-e ostad, inke khodesh dare chejoor ba daneshjoo raftar mikone.

In Persian culture, we always notice age. However, well, it depends on the professor’s attitude and his personality, and how he is treating his students.

Addressee 7 (high SE, possibility) focused on the importance of attitude and its effect on his request interaction. He further explained that when he knows a professor very little, he would search for information about him; however, the student would change his attitude depending on the received attitude (6.3.5.3).

(6.3.5.3, Addressee 7, high SE)

ghabl az inke nazdik besham be ostadi, age kam beshnasam, hatman az ghabl miporsam ke pishzamine-ei dashte basham ke ba afradi ke mishnasanesh chejoori raftar mikone va aslan rah miyad ba digar daneshjoooha ya na. Va badesh khodamo ba tavajoh be pishzamine va etelatei ke daryaf kardam, khodamo amade mikonam. Che joor adamiye va shakhsiyat-esh kheyli mohemm-e. Albate negah-e ostad va barkhord-e avvalive ostad baes mishe ke man senario ro avaz konam. Masalan age pishzamine-ye man in boode ke adam-e bahali boode va manam ba khande shoro mikonam. Va olaviyyat ba hamoon barkhord-e avalu hast to hamoon mogheiiyat.

Before I approach any professor, if I know him a little, I would ask about him [from others] to know how to start and also to know if he treats students nicely. And then I would prepare myself with what information I have got from others. His personality type is important. Of course, his attitude can make my scenario changed. For example, if my background was that he is cool, I would start [my dialogue] with a smile. And the priority is with his first attitude in that given context.
Low self-esteem individuals also commented that receiving nice or strange attitudes would change their behaviour in this context. Speaker 8 (low SE, mild indirect) claimed that because the professor was strict in the scenario, he stopped asking his request which meant no further negotiation (6.3.5.4).

(6.3.5.4, Addressee 8, low SE)

*chon ostad kheyli jeddi va sarsakht sohbat kardan, man dige edameh nadadam.*

Because the professor spoke very seriously and strictly, I gave up [further negotiation].

Addressee 9 (low SE, possibility) focused on a professor’s personality type and attitude which affect how he would approach the professor (6.3.5.5).

(6.3.5.5, Addressee 9, low SE)

*man didgahi ke az ostad daram ya...chizi ke azash shenidam kheyli baram mohemm-e ke chejoor adamiye az nazari-e barkhord, ke bekham darkhasto rahat begam ya aslan bepchoonam. Nahve-ye barkhord-e ostad va hala oon lahze che barkhordi mishe age hich didgahi nadaram kheyli mohemm-e.*

What my view is about professors or…what I heard about him is very important for me and how he treats others. Then I decide whether to make my request more comfortably or stop it. His attitude is very important if I don’t know him.

Speaker 14 (low SE, direct) used a hierarchical term *az hozooreton* ‘excellency’ that shows the hierarchical status often associated with different social power. He pointed out that good-temper or bad-temper was important for him; however, he would speak politely with everyone.

His comment showed that professors’ attitude plays a role in his strategies (6.3.5.6).

(6.3.5.6, Addressee 14, low SE)

*barkhord va shakhsiyyatesh mohemm-e. Man chon oosoolan say mikonam ba hame moadabane sohbat konam chon hata ba abdarchi ham moadabane harf mizanam. Masalan barkhord-e taraf mohemm-e. Age khosh akhlagh ya bad akhlagh, kheyli mohemm-e.*

Attitude or personality type is important. Because, generally, I would try to speak with anyone, even with [low-class people like] a person whose job is cleaning, politely. For example, the interlocutor’s attitude is so important. If he is good-temper or bad-temper, it’s important.

In the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario, Speaker 18 (high SE, permission) explained that he would consider the attitude of the classmate before deciding whether to make the request.
First attitude is important. For example, if I have a good feeling with him or not. First, I would go ahead in a friendly manner but if the attitude was not good, I wouldn’t ask [my request]. But if he treats me nicely, I would ask my request.

Speaker 6 (high SE, possibility) said that he would ignore his problem and not ask for help in real life contexts, unless the attitude and wording were encouraging (6.3.5.8).

This situation has rarely happened to me in which I made requests of strangers because of the distant relationship. And I would even give up making requests. Somehow, it depends on the attitude, as it is important. The kind of wording he uses is very important.

The importance of attitude was noticed by Speaker 1 (high SE, possibility) because he did not know his classmate (6.3.5.9).

The interlocutor’s attitude at first was important because I didn’t know him at all. When I just said hello, the way he answered formed the conversation [and moved it forward].

Similarly, Addressee 1 (high SE, possibility) emphasised that his request wording would depend on the attitude he receives from his classmate like smiling or being friendly, although he would try to make the first meeting friendly if the interlocutor did not have a warm temperament. He supported his claim with the example of his first meeting with the speaker on the day of their participation in this study where both treated each other in a friendly way (6.3.5.10).
It depends on the interlocutor. For example, he smiles and the connection is created. Some might treat me coldly; then the conversation will be going on more formally. But I treat him friendlier in such situation to make him treating me in a friendly way. Look, it was our first meeting but we treated each other friendly.

The participants focused on friendly feedback, smiling, looking serious and also greetings that could make an impression on them in requesting. Warm welcoming and also appearance were stated to affect the entire request interaction. However, self-esteem did not differ in this theme. Participants did not mention attitude when discussing the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario or the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario. These are the two scenarios in which there is already a close relationship. Even though attitude was never mentioned, two participants did note one should consider the mood and friendliness of greeting at the start of the conversation. All together, this implies that a friendly attitude from the addressee is key, but that it is taken for granted if the addressee is already a friend.

6.3.6 Academic Face

Participants expressed concern about how they will be seen as a student, their academic face, due to the extension request. Laziness is the most common attribution that students might get if they cannot submit their work before it was due. When discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Speaker 4 (high SE, possibility) emphasised that proving himself as a hardworking student to his professor was important because he wished to show a strong academic and social self-image to the professor. The comment had-e aghal vejhe-ei ke mikhastam behesh neshon bedam ‘this was the least face I could show him’ showed the important of his face-saving (6.3.6.1).

(6.3.6.1, Speaker 4, high SE)

vejham joloy-e ostad mohem bood. Hadd-e aghal vejhe-ei ke mikhastam behesh neshoon bedam, na loozomn chizi ke vagheyyat-e. Mikhastam behesh neshon bedam ke adam-e sakhtkoshi hastam. Va shayadam nabasham vali mikhastam neshoon bedam va age natonestam, be in jahat boode.

It was important for me to save my face before my professor. It was the least face that I wanted to show him but not necessarily the real one. I wanted to show him that I am a hardworking student. Maybe I am not, but I wanted to show him that if I couldn’t finish [my project], it was because of this [the reason mentioned in the role play].

Speaker 6 (high SE, possibility) talked about face, although he has never been in such situations in real life. He was concerned the professor would think less of him because he
could not complete his duties on time. With the comment *adam behesh barmikhore* ‘one is upset/disappointed’, he emphasises the importance of saving face in this academic situation while not also getting the label ‘lazy’ which some students might take as insulting (6.3.6.2).

His request head act included *marhamati konin* ‘bestow a mercy upon me’ that showed hierarchy between the interactants.

(6.3.6.2, Speaker 6, high SE)


The truth is that I haven’t been exposed to such situations. And it also rarely happened to me to submit my projects late. I usually do my projects by the due date. It is sometimes good that one shows his abilities or capabilities. One should show that he’d be upset/disappointed that the professor thought he is lazy.

Speaker 8 (low SE) made a mild indirect hint which showed how he cared about the quality of the project (6.3.6.3). The student showing himself to be studious could demonstrate respect for the professor and be worthy of an extension.

(6.3.6.3, Speaker 8, low SE)

*mitoonam tahvil bedam, onjoori ke delam mikhado bayad shayad nemitoonam behetoon tahvil bedam.*

I can submit it to you, [but] it’s not like what I would like to give it to you.

In interview, the speaker also commented that although he had to ask for an extension, he was pleased with his current prestige and his presentation before his professor (6.3.6.4).

(6.3.6.4, Speaker 8, low SE)

*albate man oomadam ke ye khaheshi bokonam az ostad vali khob saram balast va sarafrazam. Aslan eltemas nemikonam chon age seda masomaneh beshe, ye tasviri to zehn-e ostad ijad mishe ke shoma…* Of course, I came to ask for a favour from my professor but I am proud of myself and my head is up. I would not beg my request because if my tone of voice changed, a different self-image will be made before my professor’s eyes…
Speaker 11 (low SE, possibility) said that upon hearing the professor’s comment in *poroje bekhater-e khodeton-e* ‘this project is for your own good’, which meant that the project’s benefit would affect the students themselves, he changed his strategy immediately, and started talking about how he was not a lazy student but was unable to accomplish the project. His claim can refer to protecting his academic face (6.3.6.5).

(6.3.6.5, Speaker 11, low SE)

*to in senario vaghti ostad goft ke in poroje be khater-e khodetono, man ye khorde mozeam ro avaz kardam va goftam manam hamchin adami nistam ke masalan tanbal basham va migam ke ostad age masalan inghadr esrar darin, manam hamchon adami nistam ke natoonam poroje ro anjam bedam va biyam eltemas konam vali age kheyli esrar darin ye chizi dorost mikonam beheton midam.*

In this prompt, when the professor said that this project is for your own good, I changed my attitude and said ‘I am not such a lazy student.’ I also said if you, Professor, insisted [to submit my project by the due date], I am not such a person that I couldn’t complete my project and haven’t come here to beg. But if you insist on [it], I would complete it somehow and turn it in to you.

The comments on academic face were only made in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. For example, the participants emphasised that *bayad adam neshoon bede ke behesh barmikhore ke ostad fekr kone tanbal hast* ‘one should show that he’d be upset/disappointed that the professor thought he is lazy.’ Getting the label of ‘lazy’ is insulting for some students. In this scenario, no significant differences were found between different levels of self-esteem.

### 6.3.7 Social Rights and Moral Obligation

One of the social factors that the participants took into account was social rights and moral obligations. It helps people to appear moral and ethical. Indeed, when discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Speaker 4’s (high SE, possibility) request was declined because the professor’s, Addressee 4’s (high SE), belief was that the request ignored the obligated equity between students, and other students would follow him and knock on the door to get an extension. The speaker did not persist with his request due to respecting the professor’s idea on fairness for all students. The student also thought he could not justify his delay; insistence could seem rather unethical. In return, the professor was happy to assist him with providing required sources (6.3.7.1).
(6.3.7.1, Speaker 4, high SE)


The fault was on my side. I thought what he was saying was about fairness. I noticed that I couldn’t justify it anymore. I understood that it was my personal problem, and it was not justified to ask someone who believes in equity to ignore his belief. I respected his word.

Other speakers accepted their professor’s decision without further negotiation or using flattering words once they knew about the reason that their request was rejected. Ceasing further argument and acceptance of the decision shows respect and politeness. Speaker 6 (high SE, possibility) explained that it was okay to make this request but when the professor (high SE) brought his logic for not accepting, the speaker as a junior respected his professor’s decision without insistence (6.3.7.2).

(6.3.7.2, Speaker 6, high SE)

man be oonvan-e daneshjoo fekr mikardam ke daram dorost migam va mitoonam ba vaght-e ezafe-ei ke behem bedan, motmaen hastam ke mitoonam poroje ro tamooom konam va garanti mikonam. Ama vaghti kasi ke manteghi harf mizane manam mipaziram hata age be zararam bashe.

I as a student thought that what I was saying was right and I would have been able to complete the project with the extension, and would also have guaranteed it. But when one speaks rationally, I would accept it even if there is no benefit for me.

Another example is Speaker 1’s (high SE, mild indirect) comment ‘I should have met the deadline’ which shows his belief about moral obligation (6.3.7.3).

(6.3.7.3, Speaker 1, high SE)

Tebgh-e ghanoon va ghaedash, bayad ta oon tarikh miresoondam va tamam mishod.

Based on the submission deadline, I should have met the deadline and completed the project [at the due time].

It would be impolite and possibly immoral to ask for an unreasonable favour. For instance, Speaker 3 (high SE, possibility) admitted his fault indirectly in the role play while he was explaining his condition (6.3.7.4).

(6.3.7.4, Speaker 3, high SE)

khodamam mitoonam eshtebahamo va ghey-r-e mostaghim gofiam.
I was aware of my fault and told him indirectly.

Examples so far have been from high self-esteem speakers, but low self-esteem participants talked about ethics and moral obligations affecting their choices as well. Speaker 11’s (low SE, possibility) comment can imply that his request was not his right (6.3.7.5).

(6.3.7.5, Speaker 11, low SE)

masalan age nomre-ye mano nemidad, man injrooi sohbat nemikardam ke to role play sohbat kardam chon ke hagh ba man bood.

For example, if he didn’t give my score, I wouldn’t speak like what I spoke in the role play because the right is with me in this case.

Addressee 9 (low SE, possibility) admitted his mistake in not meeting the deadline and claimed that he would not ask his request many times (6.3.7.6).

(6.3.7.6, Addressee 9, low SE)

na, man kheyli khahesh nemikonam. Khodam khosham nemiyad chon ye eshtebahi khodam kardam dige.

No, I wouldn’t keep requesting. I dislike it because I myself made this mistake anyway.

Speakers of low self-esteem then talked about their duties and the rights of their professor. There may be a difference as well. There was a greater tendency for the high self-esteem students to accept that their professors might have justified reasons for their refusal, even if they disagreed. The low self-esteem students, however, focused more on the role of their own fault in the situation. More work must be done to discover how robust this pattern is. The high self-esteem group spoke of their request in this hierarchical situation as if their strategy choices would make space for the request to be accepted, while the low self-esteem group continued to make requests because they perceived a space to exist within the conversation.

Talking about ethics and morality rarely happened in the other prompts except in the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario where only one speaker, Speaker 1 (high SE, possibility), explained that his classmate had the right to give his class notes to him or not. The speaker believed that he did not have any rights to ask for something which was made by his classmate, especially since borrowing was without any pay-back. It seems that the speaker found this request unethical and was okay with rejection (6.3.7.7).
6.3.8 Power

Power plays an important role in Persian hierarchical relationships and politeness (Izadi, 2016; Chapter 4). Authority and power *ghodrat* are interchangeably used by the participants because both express ability, capability, influence, authority and strength of people (Dehkhoda & Shahidi, 1374/1995)\(^\text{12}\). Seniority can also be connected to power. It is very common to respect and give power to elderly people and seniors even in cases in which they have no other high social status. Power affects request choices in the role plays (Chapter 4) and was brought up by participants in the interviews. Indeed, when discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Speaker 1 (high SE) made an indirect strategy for his request choice in this scenario (6.3.8.1).

(6.3.8.1, Speaker 1, high SE)

*meh fekr mikonam payan termamo khoob neveshte basham, monteha hanoz forsat nakardam ke kamel eee poroje ro amade bokonam va tahvil-e shoma bedam.*

Umm I think I did well in the final exam, but I haven’t found any chance to complete err the project and submit it to you.

In interview, he first commented on his choice that *hagh ba ostad-e amalan* ‘it is certainly the professor’s right’; he, the student, would not elaborate the request to get the extension because it is the professor’s power to make this decision (6.3.8.2).

(6.3.8.2, Speaker 1, high SE)

*are, chon hagh ba oon-e amalan. Va zaman ke gozashte boode gozashte. Va oonjoori nistesh ke man bekham hala talabkar basham ya lahnamo tondtar konam. Tebgh-e ghanoon va ghaedash bayad ta oon tarikh miresoondam va tamam mishood. Hala mikham azash ve emtiyaz ezaferat begirm, pas bayad azash khaahesh bokonam. Hala mitoone ya ghabool bekone, mitoone ghabool nakone. Hata agar ghabool nakone ham, baz man nemitoonam lahnamo taghir bedam ya chiz-e dig-ei begam. Faghat alan daram*

---

\(^{12}\) This reference was published in Iran using the Iranian calendar. The researcher has mapped the Iranian calendar year to the Gregorian calendar year.

Yes [I do], because he was certainly right. And the deadline he set up has been passed. And it was not like that I wanted to ask for my right or to use a serious tone of voice. I should have given my project at the due time based on the course schedule. Now I’m gonna get an extra bonus [i.e., get an extension] so I must request him to do so. It was his choice to accept or reject it. If he didn’t accept it, I couldn’t yet change my tone of voice or say anything else. I was just requesting him to do me a favour to extend the time. Because of that, my tone was like that. I’d never use those request strategies coming with the combination ‘bothering/trouble’ [i.e., ‘if no trouble,…’ or ‘do this trouble…’] because the professor would almost do nothing. We only wanted him to give more time. ‘Would it be possible to request of you?’ is more common.

Speaker 3 (high SE, possibility) suggested that the way the request was made shows there was a social hierarchy that reflects the professor’s power (6.3.8.3).

(6.3.8.3, Speaker 3, high SE)

man sayamo mikonam ta jaei ke momken-e kochik be bozorg, yani selsele maratebi bashe chon alan ghodrat dast-e oon-e.

I tried to use strategies showing hierarchical position from inferior to superior as much as possible because he has power in this context.

Seniority often carries both power and respect. Speaker 6 (high SE, possibility) viewed power of seniors in general, and professors and teachers in particular, positively: the status of seniority deserves respecting regardless of their age (6.3.8.4).

(6.3.8.4, Speaker 6, high SE)

osoolan semat-e ostadi baram mohemm-e. Man ehteram-e khasi vase ostada ya moalem haye khodam hastam bedoon-e dar nazare goftan-e seneshoon. Mosalaman oon ostadi ke senesh bishtar-e, ehttram-e bishtari barash ghel misham vali in be oon manaei nist ke age ostadi senesh kamtar-e, ehteram nazaram.

Professors’ rank is important for me. I highly respect my professor or my teachers regardless of their age. Of course, I do respect a professor who is older but it doesn’t mean I wouldn’t respect young professors.

Speaker 5 (low SE, possibility) talked about bringing himself down khod ra paein avardan before a professor to show the professor’s power (6.3.8.5).

(6.3.8.5, Speaker 5, low SE)

bara inke khodetoon ro dar halat-e paeintar gharar bedin ke ostad befahme ke ye ghodrati dare.
Because you should position yourself lower than the professor so that he realises he has power.

Addressee 11 (low SE, possibility) talked about the social rank of his MA professor whom he is still in contact with. He shows respect for his professor with the address term ostad ‘professor,’ even though there is a close relationship between them and not a big age difference. He also added that, whether he knows a professor or not, he calls them by the respected title doctor or ostad ‘doctor or professor’, not by their name (6.3.8.6). It should be noted that almost all participants used addressing titles such as ostad ‘professor’ or agha-ye doctor ‘Mr Dr’ which are interwoven with Iranian educational culture.

(6.3.8.6, Addressee 11, low SE)

ye jooraei be esm ya famil seda nemikonam. Yani che ostad ro beshnasim che nashnasim hatman ba ehteram sohbat mikonam va doctor sedash mikonam.

I don’t call [professors] by their first name or family name. I talk to professors with respect, using a title ‘Dr’ whether I know them or not.

The high self-esteem speakers (6.3.8.2) and (6.3.8.4) focused on the professor’s rights, his hierarchical position and also respecting seniors regardless of their age, while Speaker 5 (6.3.8.5, low SE) believed that he had to lower himself to show that his professor has power. Also, Addressee 11 (6.3.8.6, low SE) emphasised honorific titles for professors to respect them which can show power differences and the promotion of professor’s social rank. In short, there are two ways to build an asymmetric social relationship: raise the other party up or lower oneself. The high self-esteem speakers focused on the former, while the low self-esteem speakers added the latter.

In the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) situation, some of the participants such as Addressee 1 (high SE, direct) believed that jayegah mohemm-e chon kari az dastesh barmiyad ‘his social status is important because he can process it [the application]’. Speaker 1 (high SE, mild indirect) explained that he should request his departmental manager with a possibility condition because people know that providing funds is not completely under his control. His observation is that the departmental manager has to ask the head of department who is in a higher position than him and the manager’s answer cannot be definite. Then, the possibility strategy would fit this context (6.3.8.7).
(6.3.8.7, Speaker 1, high SE)
aز طرف مسئولیت اموزش و یکسانیت بحث وجود دارد. ولی از طرف انسان می‌تواند 100% وابستگی نداشته باشد. پس از درخواست کاهش می‌شود ولی اگر امکانش باشد چون احتمال کاهش می‌یابد که میدان داشته باشد و صحبت بگیرد و فلای می‌تواند درخواستی که می‌گذرد نیست. به نظر می‌رسد بهتر است درخواست و امکان، به طور احتمالی انجام شود یا نه.

Based on Speaker 1’s (6.3.8.7) view, the departmental manager only has partial power. But Speaker 6’s (high SE, possibility) view is that he did not ask the departmental manager directly and made a possibility choice because of different social status. This can refer to the departmental manager’s power in this situation (6.3.8.8).

(6.3.8.8, Speaker 6, high SE)
حسبین قبل از درخواست می‌خواستم که نشون‌ش ندهم که همچنین بوده 100 میلیون بحث وجود داره و من گذی بودم در این مسئله و گذات کون. همچنین در مسئله نزدیکی است ولی هم بهم نیستم به مغله‌ی بایگان بیرون داره کنی.

Also, before the request, I wanted to tell him [indirectly] that there was a 100-million budget and share it with me. Although there was familiarity, the social positions are not the same in this context. However, perhaps it was different when being out of this context.

Different power but familiar context could affect Persian requesting language. Speaker 3 (high SE, strong indirect) talked about this situation that was more or less hierarchical to him, especially in Iran. Although he had a familiar relationship with his departmental manager, he kept the polite staged communicative acts such as compliments and appreciation. He did not use formal wording as it would prevent the speaker’s ability to create a friendly context to request comfortably. However, he admitted the departmental manager was in higher position (6.3.8.9).

(6.3.8.9, Speaker 3, high SE)
احساس این که هم بسیار مرجعیتی دارم، ولی دوستم. در کل دار ایران انتدیه، یه جورای دوستم. میدونم می‌خواهد بپوزیره و یه راه‌های بهتر بده، بارا همین به اتماد به نافس‌ه بلال حرف می‌زنام. پایحات ادب‌ه زاهری هفز می‌کنام. آیه کهیلی راسم حرف بزانام، کشورمان موتیف‌هف می‌کنون و نمی‌زاره رابطه بارگزار بشه.
My sense is that this prompt is kind of hierarchical and also not, and we’re friends. In fact, it is like that in Iran; we’re a sort of friends. I knew he wanted to accept my request and to give me a suggestion so that I spoke with him with high self-confidence but I kept the ostensible politeness. If I speak formally, it would stop me and the relationship wouldn’t have been made.

Some other participants talked about the higher social status of the departmental manager which affected their request choices (6.3.8.10, high SE) and (6.3.8.11, low SE).

(6.3.8.10, Addressee 4, high SE)

dorost-e chon taraf maghami nadare vali mitoone choob la charkhet bezare. Ehsas nakone ke chon vazifash-e be man hatman javab bede.

That’s right [that] his social position is not high but he could have delayed the process. He shouldn’t feel it was his duty to answer me.

(6.3.8.11, Speaker 10, low SE)

chon daraje-ye ejtemaei-e balatari dare, senesh ham bishtare va to mohit akademik hast, bahash rasmitar sohbat mikonam.

Because he has a higher social rank, of course he is older than me and also [is working] in the academic place, I do speak with him formally.

Most of the participants claimed that the size of power in the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario is less than in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. They focused on the departmental manager’s social status which referred to his power except (6.3.8.7, high SE) and (6.3.8.10, high SE) who confirmed that the whole process of getting a grant is not in the departmental manager’s control, so that a strategy that would put pressure on him was not appropriate due to his powerlessness.

6.3.9 Relationship

Distance as a symmetrical social variable is well-known as unfamiliarity between individuals can be expressed differently in different cultures (Holmes, 1995; see section 2.3.2.1). People in the interviews talked about the level of familiarity and also the length of friendship, which depends on constant properties existing between interlocutors; they affected their informed request choices. When discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Addressee 8 (high SE, possibility) commented that rabete-ei ke ba ostad daram baram az hamash mohemmtar-e ‘my relationship with my professor is the most important factor’ in this prompt. Similarly, Addressee 13 (high SE, possibility) said that relationship plays a main role in different Iranian contexts (6.3.9.1).
In Iran, relationships are important. It means that how much you know or you don’t know someone is very important.

Addressee 11 (low SE, possibility) seconded the importance of relationships. He also said that he would use mishe? ‘Possible?’ in his choice with someone whom he does not know (6.3.9.2). Social distance would affect his request wording.

Almost to ask my requests for people to whom I’m not so close, I wouldn’t use ‘do a favour’. I would say ‘would it be possible to bring this?’ ‘Do a favour’ will be summarised in it.

Further, Addressee 18 (low SE, possibility) thought that fasele doori ke beyn-e ostad va daneshjoo hast ‘the distant relationship between the professor and the student’ would change requestive wording. The participants confirmed that relationship can have a main role in this hierarchical power situation in Iran.

In the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario, some individuals talked about how distant relationships worked out in this situation. For example, Speaker 4 (high SE, possibility) believed that he would speak similarly no matter which classmate he was talking to as he did not know any of them. He started his conversation based on his conditions rather than whom he was talking to (6.3.9.3). He also commented that possibility, his choice for the initial head act, was more polite in this context.

Also, Speaker 6 (high SE, possibility) claimed that it was rare to ask for help from strangers because of the distant relationship. He did not explain why familiarity was important for him.
but it seems that he would prefer to ask for class notes from a classmate whom he knows (6.3.9.4).

(6.3.9.4, Speaker 6, high SE)

*kheyli baram pish nayoomade ke az gharibe darkhast konam be khater-e ekhtelaf-e fasele. Va hata ya gheyd-e ghaziye ro mizanam ke darkhast nakonam.*

This situation rarely happened to me where I requested strangers because of the distant relationship. And I’d even give up asking my favour in order not to make the request.

Speaker 7 (high SE, ability) briefly said that because of *nemishnasam tarafo* ‘he did not know his classmate’, he would not change the strategy used in the role play (6.3.9.5).

(6.3.9.5, Speaker 7, high SE)

*vali kholase mikhastam bebinam mitoonam ye roozio moayyan konim man jozavato ye kopi dashte basham ta alan in ye maho?*

But anyway, I wondered can we arrange a time for me to photocopy your class notes that took a month for you to make it?

The speaker also emphasised the strategy wording should be formal such as *ye khaheshi khedmatetoon dashtam* ‘I had a request for you.’ Although there is an equal status between the interlocutors, using formal wordings shows politeness in this situation. Speaker 13 (high SE, direct) believed that he would not use a direct strategy in the first meeting if he did not know his classmate *age nashnasam, hadeaghal dar barkhord-e avval mostaghim darkhast nemikonam* ‘If I don’t know [him], I wouldn’t request directly, at least not in the first contact’, although he used a form of direct question in the role play. However, his direct strategy included *lotf mikonin?* ‘Would you do a favour?’ which is a polite phrase. Therefore, not knowing his classmate influences his request choice. Speaker 17’s (high SE, need/want) comment in the beginning of the conversation was about the importance of distance, but after that, the attitude he got from his classmate became important (6.3.9.6).

(6.3.9.6, Speaker 17, high SE)

*vaghti bahash daram salam aleyk mikonam rabeteye door mohemm-e vali vaghti salam aleyk tamoom shod, tarkibi az nahveye barkhord va rabeteye door baram mohemm-e. Naheveye barkhord hatman miyad dar oon moadele.*

When I was saying ‘hi’ and ‘How are you?’, the distant relationship was important but when the greeting was done, the combination of attitude and distant relationship were important. Attitude is in the formula.
Low self-esteem speakers also commented on distance in this prompt. Speaker 5 (low SE, possibility) believed that because he did not know his classmate, it was like the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario as he was not familiar with the professor, either. However, he said that he did not use formal wording with his unfamiliar classmate, perhaps due to the equal status (6.3.9.7).

(6.3.9.7, Speaker 5, low SE)

*chon nemishnakhtam tarafo shod mesl-e senario avval va rabete ba ostad. Chon barkhord-e avvalemoon boode, nemitoonam begam ‘rastesh mikhastam... ’ va kheyli rasmi nashe.*

Because I did not know him, it was like the first scenario [the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario], the distant relationship with the professor. Because it was the first meeting, I could not use ‘actually, I wanted to...’ and formal wording, either.

In Speaker 8’s (low SE, possibility) view *kheyli moadabaneh darkhast mikonom* ‘I request very politely’, he would use phrasing that is not used with close friends. Although there is no power difference, he would be careful in his choice because of unfamiliarity. Addressee 3 (low SE, possibility) explained that when he did not know his classmate, he did not lower himself due to an equal status. He added that he would also not use a strategy showing hierarchy (6.3.9.8).

(6.3.9.8, Addressee 3, low SE)

*are, taraf baram mohemm-e. Chon alan vaghti kesio nashnasam ya mosavi bashim, khodamo ziyad paein nemiyaram dige. Selsele maratebi nabashe chon dotaeimon daneshjooim.*

Yes, the interlocutor is important for me. Because when I don’t know a person or we're equal, I wouldn’t then make myself lower. It wouldn’t be hierarchy because we both are students.

Putting scenarios together, the low self-esteem students appeared to pay attention to whether or not to lower themselves in the situation. When speaking with the professor, they were more inclined to lower themselves than the high esteem speakers. With a fellow student, they were careful not to lower themselves due to the equal status. There was not such attention to this issue with the high self-esteem speakers.

In the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, requests such as asking for money can put pressure on the addressee and can hurt the requester’s pride if it is not met, as discussed before. Speakers mentioned the particular history of the relationship as important for this
request, indicating closeness can have a main role in this context. For example, Addressee 13 (high SE, ability) stated inke ghablan ham injoor etefaghi ooftade ke azash pool behkay, mohemm-e ‘It’s important that asking for money [from your friend] has happened before.’ Speaker 1 (high SE, possibility) emphasised the friendship background and the history of offering help (borrowing-lending) between friends, and also the level of closeness in making requests (6.3.9.9).

(6.3.9.9, Speaker 1, high SE)

on pishzamine-ye dosti mohemm-e. Shayad dar gozashte mavarede moshabehi boode ke man 10 ta kar barash anjam dadam, hala ye kar azash mikham. Be nazaram mizane samimiyat va on sabegheye dosti mohemm-e. The friendship background is important. Perhaps, in the past, there were similar situations and I helped my friend; this time I need his help. In my view, the level of closeness and the friendship record are important.

Some other speakers also talked about the importance of the level of closeness in this situation. Speaker 6 (high SE, mild indirect) focused on daraje-ye samimiyat kheyli mohemm-e ‘the level of friendliness is important.’ Because he has a couple of close friends, he would choose one of them to ask for money. Speaker 7 (high SE, strong indirect) explained that his close friend knows his personality so his friend has already told him, if he needs a help, to let him know (6.3.9.10).

(6.3.9.10, Speaker 7, high SE)

chon doost-e samimi hast, mosalaman roohiyat-e mano mishnase. Chon ke khod-e doostam ghablan gofte bood, kari dari ya komaki mikhay behem bego hatman. Because he is my close friend, he knows my personality. Because my friend already told me, if you need any help, do let me know.

Addressee 1 (high SE, direct) expressed that he would request directly with his close friends as there is no taarof in friendship (6.3.9.11). Direct requests can be used in friendly relationship as there is less distance, less taarof.

(6.3.9.11, Addressee 1, high SE)

yani vaghti doost-e samimi-e, adam mostaghim harfesho mizane va mige taarof baham nadarim. Nemikham dostimoon..., nemikham dar dardesar biyofiti. Samimiyat mohemm-e vali ba jediyaye bishtari. It means when I ask my need directly from a close friend, I emphasise we have no taarof with each other. I don’t want our friendship…I don’t want you to be in trouble. Closeness is important but [request] with a bit of seriousness.
Low self-esteem speakers also focused on the level of closeness which influenced their requestive wordings. However, they would still use supportive language (6.3.9.12).

(6.3.9.12, Speaker 14, low SE)

\[\text{hata ba samimitar} \text{in doostan ham age} \text{kharesh} \text{dasht.he basham, kharesh mikonam.}\]

Even with my closest friend if I have a request, I would use requestive words [including please].

Speaker 8 (low SE) had a different idea with Speaker 14 (6.3.9.12) and claimed that he would not use a possibility strategy with his close friend. Rather he would use almost direct strategies. Despite saying this in the interview, he requested with possibility in the role play itself. He also added that such requests (borrowing-lending) make friendship stronger and can add more meaning to it. He differed in his requests to a professor and a close friend (6.3.9.13).

(6.3.9.13, Speaker 8, low SE)

\[\text{man fekr mikonam darkhast az ostad sakhtar-e ta doost-e samimi chon hamin} \text{darkhast ha rabeteha ro misaze va hamin bede bestanha mohkamtar mikone ravahe.to. Man ye} \text{kam sath-e tavagham az doostam bala hast vali na inke vazife bashe.}\]

I think asking a professor is more difficult than a close friend. Because such requests build the relationship and exchanging makes it stronger. I have a somewhat high expectation from my close friends but it doesn’t mean that it’s their duty.

Similarly, Speaker 9 (low SE, possibility) claimed that he would not ask his request with possibility with his real close friend, different to his choice in the role play, instead a bit more direct choice like ability \[\text{mitooni ye meghdar pool behem bedi?} \]\ ‘Can you give me some money?’ which seemed more friendly strategy to him (6.3.9.14). “Ability” requests are considered more direct than possibility, though they are not direct in the Trosborg classification.

(6.3.9.14, Speaker 9, low SE)

\[\text{age vaghean doost-e samimim bashe, nemigam ‘emkan dare?.’ Ye khorde mostaghimtar migam.}\]

Yes, if he is a real close friend, I wouldn’t say ‘it’d be possible?’ I would say it a bit direct.

Borrowing money seems difficult to many of the participants and the level of closeness is a determining factor in this situation. Speaker 11 (low SE, possibility) and Addressee 5 (low SE,
(6.3.9.15, Speaker 11, low SE)

*man kheyli kheyli sakhtam-e ke bekham az kesi pool gharz konam. Vali kheyli bastegi dare be rabete-ei ke ba doost-e samimim daram.*

It’s very very difficult for me to ask for money from someone. However, it depends very much on the relationship I have with my close friend.

(6.3.9.16, Addressee 5, low SE)

*samimiyyat mohemm-e, darid pool gharz mikonid.*

Closeness is important, [because] you’re borrowing money.

In the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, Speaker 3 (high SE, strong indirect) underlined that the relationship helped him to speak with high self-confidence. That is why he stressed past moments he had in common with his departmental manager in the role play (6.3.9.17).

(6.3.9.17, Speaker 3, high SE)

*ehsasam in-e ke ham kheyli selsele maratebi ham nist, va dostim. Dar vaghe dar iran intorie, ye joraei dostim. Midoonam mikhad bepazire va ye rah-e hali bede, bara hamin ba etemad be nafs-e bala harf mizanam. Faghat adab-e zaherio hefz mikonam. Age kheyli rasmi harf bezanam, khodesh mano motevaghef mikone va nemizare rabbete bargharar beshe. Vaghti behesh goftam ba shoma vallibal bazi mikardim, man gard shakhsiyatishe mishkanam yani ma doostimo ina.*

My sense is that this prompt is a kind of hierarchical and also not, and we’re friends. In fact, it is like that in Iran; we’re a sort of friends. I knew he wanted to accept my request and to give me a suggestion so that I spoke with him with high self-confidence but I kept the ostensible politeness. If I speak formally, it would stop me and the relationship wouldn’t have been made. When I recalled we were playing volleyball, I broke his guard down which means we’re friends.

Speaker 15 (high SE, strong indirect) emphasised that relationship was important as he would have changed his strategy if he did not know the departmental manager (6.3.9.18). Addressee 7 (high SE, possibility) also strongly confirmed that relationship has an influence in such contexts (6.3.9.19).

(6.3.9.18, Speaker 15, high SE)

*are, in shenakhtan mohemm-e. Yani age nemishnakhtam, motmaenan injoori nemigoftam.*

Yes, the familiarity is important. It means if I didn’t know [him], I wouldn’t never have said this way.
While some high self-esteem participants made comments about the relationship in this scenario, almost every low self-esteem participant did. Speaker 10 (low SE, strong indirect) addressed that the factor friendship is important and should not be misused in this context (6.3.9.20). A friendly relationship can threaten the addressee’s freedom.

Speaker 11 (low SE, possibility) pointed out that because he was a friend of his departmental manager, he did not need to prepare himself much beforehand. He seemed that he could talk about his request comfortably (6.3.9.21).

Speaker 9’s (low SE, strong indirect) claim, however, distinguished between familiarity with a departmental manager and intimacy with a close friend (6.3.9.22).

Speaker 14 (low SE, possibility) commented that even with my closest friend, I would use requestive words’ (i.e., khahesh kardan/request including please) and possibility was his request choice (6.3.9.23). By requestive words, he might mean polite friendly semi-formal words but not hierarchical, direct or casual wording.

Speaker 14 (low SE, possibility) commented that even with my closest friend, I would use requestive words’ (i.e., khahesh kardan/request including please) and possibility was his request choice (6.3.9.23). By requestive words, he might mean polite friendly semi-formal words but not hierarchical, direct or casual wording.
I just wondered would it be possible to get a grant for my project?

Speaker 8 (low SE, possibility) believed that the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario did not have a distant relationship like the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. It referred to the familiarity between student and his departmental manager (6.3.9.24) that can be important in choosing the language.

(6.3.9.24, Speaker 8, low SE)

va inja aslan mohit-e khoshk-e senario avval ro nadare.
This prompt is not serious/dry like the first scenario [the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario].

Addressee 11 (low SE, possibility) focused on the importance of the request topic but added that familiar relationships can make requests friendly (6.3.9.25).

(6.3.9.25, Addressee 11, low SE)

noe darkhast mohemm-e vali chon yaro ro mishnasam, mishe samimitar goft.
The type of request is important but because I know my addressee, it’d be possible to request in a friendly manner.

Interestingly, all examples in this familiar prompt except three (6.3.9.17), (6.3.9.18) and (6.3.9.19) are from low self-esteem group. The low self-esteem speakers appear more tentative about the friendly relationship. The high self-esteem speakers only spoke of the relationship making the request easier. The low self-esteem speakers, however, were sure not to take advantage of the friendship, noted that this close relationship was not truly intimate, and spoke of preparing for the encounter. In sum, they seem less secure in the situation than the high self-esteem speakers.

6.3.10 Imposition
Respecting seniors either verbally or with respectful attitude is expected by juniors. Demanding requests might be avoided in junior-senior relationships. Indeed, when discussing the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, Speaker 6 (high SE, possibility) believed that the size of the request and to what extent the situation is critical are important factors which refer to the effort involved in the request for the requestee (6.3.10.1).
The focus in Brown and Levinson (1987) regarding imposition is the imposition on the addressee. The greater the imposition on the hearer, the more polite the speaker must be. Speaker 6, however, is referring partially to the importance both to the hearer and to himself.

Speaker 1 (high SE, mild indirect) rejected using moves such as *bi zahmat* ‘no trouble’, because his further evaluation was that the request scenario involved low imposition, since *chon oon amalan kari nemikone* ‘because he [the professor] would almost do nothing.’ He commented that the effort involved for his interlocutor was very little. He seemed to be trying to balance the power differences and the limited imposition of the request. Speaker 13 (high SE, direct) also believed that this request, getting an extension, would not make a physical trouble for the professor (6.3.10.2).

Addressee 9 (low SE, possibility), however, claimed that the request topic is important which meant that giving an extension is a big favour in this situation (6.3.10.3).

Of course, the type of request is really important because the professor would do a big favour for me which is out of the discipline and he would give an extension and make an exception for me.
Some participants with low self-esteem had similar ideas on ‘no trouble’ strategies. Speaker 8 (low SE, mild indirect) said that *zahmat vase masael-e fiziki hast* ‘‘no trouble’ is used for physical activities.’ It might imply that the request, asking for an extension, would not put trouble on the professor as it was not asking for anything physical. Self-esteem did not show any outstanding difference in this different power context.

In discussing the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, Speaker 4 (high SE, ability) said that the request topic itself is important and he wanted to avoid pressuring his friend. That the request complied with his friend’s condition was the most important factor for him (6.3.10.4).

(6.3.10.4, Speaker 4, high SE)

> noe darkhast mohemm-e. Bahsiye ke on yeho to mazighe gharar nagire, va ya aslan nakhad be har dalili.

The request topic is important. The point was to not put my friend into trouble, and or he does not want [to accept the request] with any reason.

Imagining this scenario was terrible for some speakers. For example, Speaker 2 (high SE, ability) found the imposition of this request very high. He highlighted that he never asked anyone, even his father, for money. Instead, he suggested that he would withdraw from the course and not borrow the money (6.3.10.5).

(6.3.10.5, Speaker 2, high SE)

> aslan to katam nemire in senario. Man az babam pool nagereftam. Tasavvoresh baram sakh-e. Aslan baram va sahshatnak-e bara man az kesie pool bekham. Aslan ghashang enseraf midam va poolo nemigiram

This scenario is never my favourite. I haven’t borrowed money from my dad. It is difficult to imagine this situation. It is terrible for me to borrow money from someone. I would withdraw [from the college] and not get money.

Similarly, Speaker 3 (high SE, strong indirect) strongly believed that the most difficult request was asking for money. He connected his reason for not asking for money to Persian culture. He compared the topic of two scenarios and thought that ‘borrowing money’ is more difficult than ‘asking for an extension’. Thus, high imposition is involved in this friendly equal prompt (6.3.10.6).

(6.3.10.6, Speaker 3, high SE)

> pool az hamechiz mohemtar-e. Shakhttarin darkhast, darkhast-e pool-e. Har darkhasti begin az nazareman rahattar-e. Pool mesle marg-e. Vaghean man ta jaei ke betoonam
Money is more important than everything else. The most difficult request is requesting money. Any request is easier than requesting money to me. I would try my best not to ask for money unless I have to; it is still difficult, of course. This is what I know from our culture. Even if I want to ask for money now and return it at the next two hours, I think I would be destroyed.

Speaker 17 (high SE, mild indirect) had a different idea in using the request language. His claim is that it is not his type to use requestive words such as *khaheshi/arzi dashtam khedmatet ‘I had an appeal for you’* in this friendly context. He also commented that the size of the request is important (6.3.10.7).

(6.3.10.7, Speaker 17, high SE)

*vaghti do nafar baham samimi hastan dige shakhsiyat to factor ha nist; noe darkhast mohemm-e.*

When two people are close, personality is not the case; the request topic is important.

Because borrowing money refers to financial status, a couple of high self-esteem participants did not feel comfortable with asking it from their close friend amid concern not to show his poor financial status nor to ask about their friend’s status (6.3.10.8).

(6.3.10.8, Addressee 16, high SE)

*ta jaei ke emkan dashte bashe az kesi darkhast nemikonam. Noe darkhast ke kheyli mohemm-e. Masalan age ketabi betoonam bekham, migiram va darkhast nemikonam ke zahmati be kesi nadam va inke darkhast rad nashe. Chon be nodrat pish oomade ke bekham darkhasti ro rad konam.*

I would not request anyone as far as possible. The request topic is very important. For example, if I can buy a book, I would do that and not borrow it in order not to put someone in trouble. And it rarely happened to me to reject requests.

Addressee 8 (high SE, ability) believed that the request topic would be really important as he would ask his friend to lend him some money not to get ‘a pizza’ but only for something important. This comparison showed the high imposition in this situation (6.3.10.9).

(6.3.10.9, Addressee 8, high SE)

*chon masalan az doostam nemikham ke bere pitza begire. Vase hamin noe darkhast mohemtare. Har darkhast az doost-e samimi sakhtar-e.*
Because, for example, I would not ask my friend to get a pizza. Because of that, the request topic is important. Any request from a close friend would be harder [than anyone else].

Low self-esteem participants also had similar views on imposition and connected it to Persian culture. Addressee 10 (low SE, mild indirect) thought that asking for money is not welcome in Persian culture, although he would meet the request if he will be asked. It seems that this topic is very difficult for Persian men (6.3.10.10).

(6.3.10.10, Addressee 10, low SE)

fekr mikonam jozve farange irani hast ke gharz gerefian-e pool nemishe. Kesi ke azam pool gharz bekhad, hatman behesh gharz midam.
I think borrowing money is not included in Persian culture. If I am asked to lend some money, I would do.

Pride would keep participants from asking, but the importance of the topic would push participants toward asking. It is interesting that the participants who found asking for money difficult in this prompt compared it with a situation asking for money from their father, although there was equal power with close friends (6.3.10.11).

(6.3.10.11, Speaker 10, low SE)

I am hypersensitive to [and struggle with] asking for money. Even when I was a kid, it was difficult for me to get money from my dad. Maybe if I wanted to borrow my friend’s car, it would have been easier. But I am not a person to borrow anything from people; it is difficult for me. My tone of voice was low [in the role play] because it was a weak/negative point for me. I think it’s Iranian pride, Persian men’s pride. I have never done it; that’s why I played with words to make it (the request). I was a kid and wanted to ask for money from my dad. It was a nightmare because it might have damaged the friendly relationship.

However, Speaker 8 (low SE, possibility) thought that asking for an extension in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario was more difficult than asking for money from a close friend in the
Friends-Borrowing Money (−P–D) scenario (6.3.10.12) which is opposite to what Speaker 3 (high SE) said.

(6.3.10.12, Speaker 8, low SE)

man fekr mikonam darkhast az ostad sakhtar-e ta doost-e samimi chon hamin darkhast ha’ rabetehao misaze va hamin bede bestanha mohkatmar mikone ravabeto. Man ye kam sath-e tavagham az doostam bala hast vali na inke vazife bashe.

I think requesting something from a professor is more difficult than from a close friend. Because such requests build the relationship and exchanging make it stronger. I have a bit high expectation from my close friends but it doesn’t mean that it’s their job.

In the Manager-Checking an Application (+P–D) scenario, Speaker 4 (high SE, possibility) made a comment that ye darkhast-e mamoli hast ‘it’s a casual request’ and the departmental manager was not doing a favour for him but was doing his job, which is similar to Addressee 13 (high SE, possibility) who commented that the request (i.e., checking the application’s status) is a casual request which implied low imposition. However, Addressee 4 (high SE, possibility) said that ‘his social position is not high but he could have delayed the process. He shouldn’t feel it was his duty to answer me.’ The imposition in this prompt was somewhat high for this individual.

Similar to Addressee 13 (high SE), Speaker 11 (low SE, possibility) explained that the departmental manager was responsible to process his request. However, he added if the request was something else, he would use another request choice (6.3.10.13). Namely, if the request topic involved a low imposition, it affected his request choice, possibility.

(6.3.10.13, Speaker 11, low SE)

chon masool hast ke berim soraghesh, bayad oon kar ro anjam bede. Vali masalan age ye barge faghat mikhad behemon bede, migam: ‘ono bi zahmat midi?’

Because he was the person in charge, when I go and ask him, he has to do my request. But, for example, if I want him to give me a paper, I would say: ‘would you give me that with no trouble?’

Addressee 3 (low SE, mild indirect) believed that this request topic in this prompt was easier because the manager did not need to give the money from his own pocket (6.3.10.14). It indicates that the imposition involved in this context is low compared to the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P–D) scenario.
(6.3.10.14, Addressee 3, low SE)


The request type is important. Because he himself didn’t need to give [the fund], the request was a bit easier for me. I knew that he didn’t need to put a lot of effort in. Relationship can also be important, but first the request topic is important for me. If I was supposed to ask the person himself for something, it was very different. But, this person was the third party in this request [for the grant].

Except Addressee 4 (high SE), the high and low self-esteem participants who commented on imposition believed that there was low imposition involved in the request in this context. Its imposition was also compared to the request topic in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario, in which there is a shared factor, no social distance. It seems that different levels of self-esteem did not make any differences on imposition.

### 6.4 SUMMARY

This chapter analysed what the participants reflected on when asked about their request choices. The interview analysis answered the last research question ‘Why are particular request choices made in different academic Persian situations? What are the reasons?’ Key notions that emerged from the data included *taarof*, pride, humility, giving the addressee an option, attitude, academic face, social rights and moral obligations, power, relationship and imposition. The list of these themes indicates that in addition to general social factors such as power and distance (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987), cultural and individual factors were in the mind of participants and had a role in creation of or modification of the situation. This lends additional support to the results of Chapter 4.

There is also some evidence regarding people of different self-esteem treating requests differently, such as with the discussion of *taarof*. High self-esteem participants tended to provide the request and state they would take any refusal lightly without pursuing the matter further in the close friendship. The low self-esteem speakers, while agreeing that they should not pressure or burden their friends, emphasise the special nature of their friendship in handling this important matter.
7.1 INTRODUCTION

In this final chapter, I will look at each research question and then do a comparison to previous studies on Persian, ending with limitations of the research and then conclude findings across the entire thesis. Sections 7.2-7.4 summarise the findings of the study, looking at each research question in turn.

7.2 RESEARCH QUESTION 1

This study asked ‘How do social distance, sociocultural power, and self-esteem influence request behaviour in Persian?’ Consistent with Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) theory, social factors contributed to the weightiness of face-threatening acts in Persian, which influenced the forms of request that the participants employed in their speech. The personal factor of self-esteem also had some impact. The next subsections will discuss each of the factors where had an impact on requests, using data from each analytical point of view: requests as speech acts, requests as conversations, and requests according to the participants’ perceptions.

7.2.1 Power

Here are the key speech act findings on power in review: Social power had a significant effect on the total number of words, the total number of turns, the total number of request strategies including internal and external supportive moves, and the number of all head acts (as presented in sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2). The requesters applied a greater number of words, turns, request strategies and request head acts in the +Power scenarios than in the –Power scenarios.
critique of such findings in the past, however, was that the dimension of Power might be researcher-imposed and not reflect how participants think of requests. Against that argument, the effect of power also came up in the interviews (section 6.3.8). In the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, most of the participants’ comments focused on the departmental manager’s social status which referred to his power, although they claimed that the manager had only a partial power compared to the greater degree of power for the professor.

Looking at requests as conversations (Chapter 5) also identified that the professor often controlled the conversation: the professor led the conversation with questions, the conversation usually ended when the professor had made a final decision, the professor reframed the request at times, and the professor usually ended up assigning the student something to do, even though the request was asking the professor to do something.

Power also had an effect on three particular external supportive moves: disarmers, supportive reasons, and promise of a reward. A greater number of these external supportive move strategies was used in the +Power scenarios than in the –Power scenarios (section 4.4.5). Also, the highest number of external supportive moves occurred in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. Examining requests as conversations (Chapter 5) offers possible motivations for the higher use in +Power situations. Looking at one case, the supportive moves concept in the Trosborg (1995) or Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) classifications puts the focus on the single request speech act made by the requester, and then argues that supportive moves build that request up to be more polite. Within the context of a full conversation, however, supportive reasons are not just more polite, but something that must be done to justify the request. Most turns in the conversation are arguably about this justification. In other words, in a conception of politeness that utilises a strategic orientation based around the speaker, the speaker determines the appropriate linguistic strategy to use to present their request. While this is arguably true, it is also the case, based upon the current analysis, that speakers make moves in response to prompts from the requestee, and thus both speakers are influencing which moves are made and when, not the requester alone. Moreover, the conversational aspect of the hierarchical conversation may be contributing to the greater number of moves in +Power situations. Namely, when a junior is justifying to a senior, the senior is inclined to ask more questions about the reasons for the request. If the senior asks for a reason, the junior will supply one. This shows up as the speaker offering more supportive reasons, but is in fact triggered not by the one requesting, but by the one being requested. One explanation is that a requester chooses to use more supportive moves when speaking to a senior. Another
explanation is that seniors ask more questions of juniors, forcing them to use more supportive moves. This is the difference between speech act analysis and interactional analysis. In equal situations, working with the data suggests that the requestee asks fewer questions, but a full interactional look must be extended to those conversations to know for sure.

In sum, Power appeared to trigger differences in speech act counts, was identified by participants as being important, and showed up in the way the conversation flowed and was controlled.

7.2.2 Distance

Distance in a social relationship had an effect on request behaviour in several ways. Participants used a greater number of indirect choices in the +Distance scenarios than in the −Distance scenarios (section 4.4.2), so that the speakers were not inclined to directly ask the hearer to do something, but instead hinted at it. This connected to a pattern when looking at the request as a conversation as well. In the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario, the speakers often oriented their request towards the joint project of the research project about which their addressee cared. Almost all of these dialogues ended up focusing on what the student would do to complete the assignment. Talking about the project, rather than the professor’s actions directly, would motivate greater use of indirect hints. What we see then is not a speaker being more indirect “to be polite” but orienting their whole conversation in a way that results in more indirect requests.

The interview comments (section 6.3.9) talked a great deal about the level of familiarity, sometimes distinguishing choices based on the length of friendship, the particular closeness, and the unique history, such as whether this type of request had been raised previously in their friendship. Note that the feature of distant relationship described in each of the scenario cards was not defined the same. Also, for the participants distance was not considered the same across the scenarios particularly Friends-Borrowing Money and Manager-Checking an Application. Some differentiated between intimacy with their close friends and a friendly relationship with their departmental manager in the interviews. However, some of them believed that there are different levels of intimacy among their close friends (see section 6.3.9).

Although the speech act results showed a greater indirectness (all head act) in the +Distance scenarios than in the −Distance scenarios, similar to what Brown and Levinson
predicted, the speakers made their initial requests (1st head acts) indirectly in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario where there is −Distance (section 4.4.3). This counter-intuitive result may be due to the topic, borrowing money, where speakers needed to check if their request complied with the addressee’s condition. In Blum-Kulka’s (1987) study, politeness was expressed through indirectness in scenarios with low imposition and negation forms which looked more polite, while in this study, indirect strategies were employed in the friendship where was a demanding topic for the participants to ask of their close friends. To request, two conditions should be considered: “1) the inherent capacities of the requestee, both physical and mental, 2) the external circumstances related to time, place, etc. of the action” (Trosborg, 1995, p. 198). For that reason, the speakers often employed indirect hints in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario to make sure their request would be possible for their addressee. The participants claimed that using indirectness was mainly due to giving their friends options and letting them feel free to decide (section 6.3.4). The speakers were worried about making their close friends uncomfortable if he were not able to afford the request. This concern for the hearer’s ability to comply and the pressure they may feel is compatible with the Brown and Levinson (1987) notion of requests as a face threat (see sections 2.3 & 2.3.1.1). Márquez Reiter (2000, 2002) looking at Britain and Uruguay has previously shown that when there was minimal social distance between interlocutors, they applied more direct request strategies. However, in the current study, some expressed the idea that these difficult exchanges make the friendship stronger if they were successfully navigated.

The interview discussions indicated that, when asking for money, the degree of intimacy influenced people’s language choices and also whether their friendship would continue safely even if the request was not met. The participants claimed that requesting close friends should be made directly (see also, Brown & Levinson, 1978, 1987); however, the speakers’ and the addressees’ alternative examples in the interviews were still most frequently conventionally indirect such as ability strategy. The ability strategy uses the second person pronoun in Persian mitooni kami pool behem gharz bedi ta man pool-e khabgaho bedam? ‘Can you lend me some money to pay my accommodation charges?’ and expresses a direct sense as it questions the requestee, compared to possibility, which does not. The highest number of cost minimizing strategies occurred in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario. Therefore, giving the addressee an option does not necessarily appear in possibility request head acts and could be presented in the form of cost minimizing strategies, an external supportive move type.
Interview comments to show *taarof* at the end of a conversation or with appreciation and compliments mostly affected the frequency of external supportive moves in general and cost minimizing strategies in particular in the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario (where there is −Distance) which led to long conversations. Using external supportive moves such as cost minimizing (not doing *taarof*) to limit the pressure to accept the request in a case of non-compliance condition indicated their intention. Further, the interviews raised the issue that the friendship should not be misused for checking the application’s status with the manager which indicated limiting the imposition. One limitation of a universal coding schema such as Trosborg’s (1995) is that it would miss culturally-specific concepts such as *taarof*.

### 7.2.3 Self-Esteem

Self-esteem as an individual difference had an effect on request behaviour in several ways. The classic request as a speech act analysis indicated only one significant result on self-esteem: The participants with high self-esteem made a greater number of request head acts than the participants with low self-esteem across the four prompts (section 4.4.2). Looking at requests as conversations confirmed that high self-esteem speakers tended to have multiple requests in their negotiations in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario (section 5.3.4). To support asking for an extension, the high self-esteem speakers would commonly return to an argument, while the low self-esteem speakers only sporadically did (section 5.3.2). In this regard, the high self-esteem group spoke of their request in this hierarchical situation as if their strategy choices would make space for the request to be accepted, while the low self-esteem group continued to make requests because they perceived a space to exist within the conversation (section 6.3.7). High self-esteem participants who mentioned *taarof* and emphasised the close friendship tended to provide the request and stated they would take any refusal lightly without pursuing the matter further, while low self-esteem speakers indicated the importance of the matter, indicating it is a matter of survival (section 6.3.1). Putting these facts together, again, it suggests that high self-esteem speakers do not necessarily have more head acts in order to be more or less polite. Instead, they utilise certain interactional techniques which results in more head acts.

The high self-esteem speakers avoided addressing the ‘requestee’ more than the low self-esteem speakers (section 5.3.3). The High self-esteem speakers were more successful than low self-esteem speakers in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario (section 6.3.7) regardless of
whether they worked slowly up to their request or moved directly into the request. In the other hierarchical situation, the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario, only participants with high self-esteem commented that the departmental manager has only partial power.

The positioning that students took varied by self-esteem. When speaking with the professor, the low self-esteem students were more inclined to lower themselves to show respect to the hierarchical relationship, while the high esteem speakers raised the professor without lowering themselves. With a fellow student, low self-esteem speakers were careful not to lower themselves due to the equal status. There was not such attention to this issue with the high self-esteem speakers. The high self-esteem participants’ argument on their particular choices focused on the professor’s rights, his hierarchical position and also respecting seniors regardless of their age. In short, there are two ways to build an asymmetric social relationship: raise the other party up or lower oneself. The high self-esteem speakers focused on the former, while the low self-esteem speakers added the latter (section 6.3.8). The low self-esteem group displayed humility through lowering their position, while the high self-esteem speakers emphasised the modesty of their request form, not themselves (section 6.3.3).

The low self-esteem speakers were also more tentative about the friendly relationship in the Manager-Checking an Application (+P−D) scenario. The high self-esteem speakers only spoke of the relationship making the request easier. The low self-esteem speakers, however, were sure not to take advantage of the friendship, noted that this close relationship was not truly intimate, and spoke of preparing for the encounter. In sum, they seem less secure in the situation than the high self-esteem speakers (section 6.3.9).

The low self-esteem group focused on requesting politely but using a kind of semi-formal language in the Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D) scenario. They differentiated the language used for professors (formal) and close friends (informal), while using a direct strategy flavoured with a politeness marker was considered polite for the high self-esteem group. Brown and Levinson’s (1978, 1987) formula was true for the low self-esteem group where indirectness was used where there is a distant relationship but not for the high self-esteem group. In close friendship, the high self-esteem group focused on the history of offering help (borrowing-lending) between friends but not the low self-esteem group.
7.3 RESEARCH QUESTION 2

This study also asked ‘How do Persians accomplish a request dialogue as a joint activity?’ The results of interactional analysis focused on how request conversations were accomplished, and also on the influence of self-esteem, instead of the social variables, Power and Distance. Here are the key requests as conversations’ findings in review. Six main activities were identified:

1. Opening the request conversation
2. Justifying the request
3. Emphasizing joint goals
4. Accepting the request
5. Co-determining the request
6. Closing the request conversation

Although the topic of the activity ‘requesting an extension’ was not novel to juniors and seniors and could be a part of their academic common ground, the speakers often set up the extension topic without knowing in advance what exactly the extension in full detail would be. Lewis (1979, p. 339) treated what was shared as common ground that could be produced or changed during the course of dialogue, while Stalnaker (1978, p. 320) treated it as the presuppositions of participants doing a joint action. Details, such as its length and result, had to be created along the way through negotiation. When examining the request in an interactive conversation, it became clear that moves to determine these details were important to the particular flow of the conversation and hence the request’s (un)success, though they did not fit into any particular code in Trosborg’s (1995) schema.

There were two main common reasons for requesting an extension: inability to complete the task and important consequences. The precise reasons for the justifications were important, as a poor reason could fail. Sometimes, it was possible to see that a reason was poor, such as something vague or unexceptional. However, there was certainly no one-to-one relationship between justification and request success. A reason that succeeded in one pair conversation might fail in another.

Reasons for the extension were not always sequential, but were often mixed. To justify the request, the speakers moved around the topic, such as personal problems discussed at the
beginning reappeared at the end of negotiation. This can be different from Mills’ (2014) study as his participants talked about reaching the same goal from beginning to the end of the task, but in the current data, people mixed reasons in different moves. This may be because the game Mills had them play was inherently more linear than this topic, going from one point to another.

It was not only the reason for the extension that must be worthy, but the students themselves. Questions and statements about the student’s work habits and studiousness commonly happened in the conversations and affected the professor’s decision on whether the student deserves an extension or not. In the interviews, some comments also talked about the importance of request wordings in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. Students did not want to be viewed as lazy if they could not submit their work at the due date (section 6.3.6). One participant stated "bayad adam neshoon bede ke behesh barmikhore ke ostad fekr kone tanbal hast" ‘one should show that he’d be upset/disappointed that the professor thought he is lazy.’ Most students therefore tried to show that they were worthy of an extension due to their positive traits. However, this was not always the tack taken. Speaker 18 talked about how he was barely passing the given course instead. This student chose to focus on the risk to them of failure, believing that the professor would also care about preventing such failure.

The key notion is that what exactly the request is does not arrive fully formed from the requester who then carefully formulates the best strategy to find success. Rather, it is co-constructed during the conversation. Sometimes the request was altered substantially and reframed from what was originally asked. For instance, a professor might frame a request for more time as a request for special treatment. When that happened, the request was likely to fail. Moreover, the request conversations did not have one single request. Multiple requests were made in almost all dialogues (15 of 18 pairs) in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario (mean number of all head acts: 2; see section 4.4). The request as speech acts analysis proved that the speakers requested more in both +Power scenarios than in the –Power scenarios (section 4.4.2).

Another key concept from examining requests as conversations is that the simple model of (1) request and (2) get response is inadequate for what happened. While the requester did initiate the first request, asking the professor to do something, the request conversations almost always ended with the professor deciding what actions the student will perform. In other words, ‘requests performed in Persian’ are not just simple speech acts with supporting moves; they are tasks with goals, and moves are made to reach those implicit goals. Indeed, request
conversations are a joint accomplishment which are bigger than a single token of speech (see also Searle, 1969). Students frequently emphasised a shared goal—usually a high quality project—with the professor, and students ended their reasons with ‘submitting a significantly improved project.’

The questions, usually from the professor, moved the dialogues forward. The participants were coordinated on questions and answers in the conversations to accomplish the request task jointly. The participants have almost no way of resolving these issues and making decisions without questions. That is one part of the knowledge the participants must know in order to successfully participate in request conversation in Persian.

When the final determination was made or it was non-negotiable, the conversation was navigated towards the end. In each conversation, there was some point where both speakers realised that a specific request had been made (not always the same as they started with) and a decision had been reached. Therefore, they implicitly knew that the joint task of having a request conversation was accomplished. They then turned towards ending the conversation. In only one conversation was the ending not clear. In that conversation, the student believed the professor had made a decision, but then the professor started asking questions again to discuss the matter further. In this conversation, the student eventually resorted to explicitly asking if they were done. This failure to understand if the task was completed highlights the implicit success in the other seventeen conversations.

The turns taken to quit the task were to thank and appreciate the professor more than once. Practicing taarof at the end of a conversation or with appreciation and compliment phrases affected the frequency of external supportive moves (see sections 4.4 and 4.4.5). The interview claims focused on the appropriateness and worthiness of using such phrases in Persian culture. Repeating of thanking, praising and apologies were stated to be common for adab.

7.4 RESEARCH QUESTION 3

The last question this study asked is ‘Why are particular request choices made in different academic Persian situations? What are the reasons?’ This could add to the understanding of common structures used in Persian dialogues.
Here are the key interview findings in review. Most common emic understandings of *adab* were identified through interview questions. Ten main ideas which have been unresolved in previous works emerged:

1. *Taarof*
2. Pride
3. Humility
4. Giving the addressee an option
5. Attitude
6. Academic face
7. Social rights and moral obligations
8. Power
9. Relationship
10. Imposition

*Taarof* was often viewed as a foundational principle of Persian social relationships and politeness (Beeman, 1976, 1986; Mir-Djalali, 1992; Koutlaki, 2002, Izadi, 2016; see also section 2.4). It was commented on mostly in the −Power situations. One of the comments stated that *ma ghashang taarofi hastim* ‘we [Iranians] are totally *taarofi’* (section 6.3.1).

Complimenting, appreciating and thanking are common *taarof* practices in academic junior-senior relationships. Another participant claimed he would respect, appreciate and compliment his departmental manager for the purpose of *taarof* (section 6.3.1). They might have different functions but generally create a situation to get positive feedback as well as display *adab*. However, the interview discussions on closeness indicated that how the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario was not a place to practise *taarof*, which was critical for how they chose to express themselves. This result is somewhat different from Izadi (2016). The interaction of the degree of closeness and the imposition is important in using *taarof* as it can result in distance between friends. *Taarof* generally refers to strong insistence on offers and refusals in Persian culture (Koutlaki, 2002). This would suggest that requesting or lending money would come with a strong practice of *taarof*; however, the nature of friendship changes
When friendship is close, frankness is to be valued and not covered over with *taarof*.

Pride is another cultural idea discussed in the interviews. Previous methodologies did not uncover this and it is a new finding from this study. Persian speakers discussed pride when powerlessness, inability or a necessity in asking for a favour happened. Indeed, when the request was demanding, the participants preferred choosing language choices that did not attack their strength and subsequently men’s pride (section 6.3.2). For example, adding the prepositional phrase with first person pronoun *dar hagh-e man ‘in my rights/for my sake’* in request wordings would express inferiority and also hurt men’s pride.

Humility is an important principle that many commented on which was not noticed in the literature on request forms. Being *motavaze ‘humble’* can increase the chance of acceptance; however, being humble is differentiated from begging (section 6.3.3). Modesty generally has a positive meaning and is appreciated in Iranian academia. The participants suggested *khod ra paein biyar-e ‘to lower himself’* before a professor is one of the ways to request with modesty (section 6.3.3). Using apology expressions could help lowering position and approaching modesty. Possibility choices as the right style of request was viewed as being modest when requesting from an unfamiliar classmate.

Another idea that was frequently mentioned in the interviews was giving the addressee an option. The possibility request strategy gives an option to interlocutors to feel free to reject the request if it is demanding (section 6.3.4). Alternatively, speakers used a permission strategy such as *hala mishe kopi [begiram] ‘Well, [would it be] possible to photocopy?*’ to give an option to his interlocutor who was unfamiliar. However, in friendship, when the request is demanding, indirect hints as the most frequent request strategy had the role of giving the close friend an option. Cost minimizing strategies, an external supportive move type, such as *motmaen basham? ‘Are you sure?’* and *taarof nadarim ‘we don’t have taarof*’ could help limit the pressure and avoid the friends being in *rudarbayesti* (the result of accepting unwanted offers and requests due to an unwillingness to refuse, see also section 2.4). Claims of giving the addressee an option in the +Power but –Distance prompt equals seeking a suggestion, indicating a trivial threat to the addressee’s freedom. This principle of giving an option partially motivates possibility as the most common request head act choice.

The addressee’s attitude is the next interview finding from this study that previous methodologies did not address. The professor’s good-tempered or bad-tempered manner has a main role in approaching the request. If a professor looks serious or tough, skipping the request
or giving up the negotiation would be the speakers’ choice (section 6.3.5). One speaker commented that when he knows a professor very little, he would search for information about him; however, the student would change his attitude depending on the received attitude. Also, the participants expressed that their request wording would depend on the attitude they receive from their classmates like smiling or being friendly.

Participants also talked about their concerns about their academic face and how professors would think of them; the comments were only made in the Professor-Extension (+P+D) scenario. The comment had-e aghal vejhe-ei ke mikhastam behesh neshon bedam ‘this was the least face I could show him’ showed the importance of proving himself as a hardworking student to the professor (section 6.3.6). With the comment bayad adam neshoon bede ke behesh barmikhore ke ostad fekr kone tanbal hast ‘one should show that he’d be upset/disappointed that the professor thought he is lazy’, one students emphasises the importance of saving face and how getting the label of ‘lazy’ is insulting. Caring about the quality of the project can present students as studious, demonstrate respect for the professor and be a worthy reason for the request.

The other social factor the participants focused on is social rights and moral obligations. Acceptance of professors’ decision from juniors shows respect and politeness (section 6.3.7). Respecting the professor’s idea on fairness for all and admitting the mistake help students to look moral and ethical. Then assisting students other than the request was sometimes offered by professors.

Power and Distance or Relationship were also directly brought up by participants in their interviews, as just discussed (see sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2).

The last idea commented on interviews is about demanding requests, which are often avoided in junior-senior relationships. However, the size of the request and to what extent the situation is critical are important factors (section 6.3.10). The focus in Brown and Levinson (1987) regarding imposition is the imposition on the addressee. McLaughun et al. (1983) have shown that the greater the imposition on the hearer, the more polite the speaker must be showing consistency with Brown and Levinson’s model. However, the participants referred to the importance both to the hearer and to the speaker himself. One student’s evaluation was that the request asking for an extension involved low imposition, since chon oon amalan kari nemikone ‘because he [the professor] would almost do nothing.’ He commented that the effort involved for his interlocutor was very little. He seemed to be trying to balance the power differences and the limited imposition of the request. Borrowing money in the friendly
situation looked very imposing so that request choices were carefully chosen to reduce the pressure.

Overall, these results confirmed the reliability and compatibility of general social variables of Brown and Levinsn’s (1978, 1987) theory in Persian academic settings, but indirectness was not necessarily produced for the sake of politeness, and instead for the sake of speakers.

The first wave politeness literature suggests that social power, distance and imposition are significantly needed to understand politeness, but they seem insufficient to evaluate *adab* in totality as different emic understandings of Persian politeness were identified in the simulated recall interview and the speakers thought about other cultural and individual factors as well when deciding how to express their request in different contexts. Evaluating interlocutors’ understanding of politeness is the focus of discursive approaches which was not addressed in Brown and Levinson’s approach. However, Van der Bom and Mills (2015) point out that, despite well-documented limitations, some scholars returned to applying the Brown and Levinson theory because they did not find discursive politeness approach as a practical alternative. The current study uses both to look at pragmatic data.

### 7.5 COMPARISON TO PREVIOUS STUDIES ON PERSIAN

I turn now to comparing these results to previous literature on Persian requests and politeness more generally. All three analyses of request exchanges showed that social power, distance and self-esteem influenced the number and the form of request choices and the length of request interactions in this study. For instance, the number of requests and modifications was greater in +Power situations. Regarding the length of the request conversations, analysis of requests as speech acts confirmed a greater number of words and turns in both +Power and +Distance situations. Power was also relevant in previous research on Persian. Izadi’s (2016) study showed that power plays an important role in Persian hierarchical relationships and politeness.

Conventionally indirect is the most frequent choice used. The result of conventionally indirect as a frequent request strategy in Persian matches the results by Salmani Nodoushan (2008) and Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2010).

The number and the type of request choices in this study look different from some of the previous studies on Persian requests. Studies by Eslamirasekh (1993) and Salmani Nodoushan (2008) showed very few indirect request hints in Persian, 4% and 12%, respectively. In
Saberi’s (2012) study using soap operas, no indirect hints were exemplified, whereas in the current thesis, social distance significantly affected indirectness. Participants used a greater number of indirect choices in +Distance situations. However, indirect request hints (1st head acts) were frequently made in the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario where there is −Distance. Eslamirasekh (1993) also found that Iranians frequently made direct request strategies more than conventionally indirect ones, whereas direct request forms were the least frequent first head act request choices in this study.

Indirectness in friendship was mainly used not to put their friends in rudarbayesti. Izadi (2016, p. 15) stated that “Complaints about unhappily accepting a request due to rudarbayesti are rife in Iranians’ every day narratives.” Using external supportive moves such as cost minimizing like ‘there is no pressure to accept the request’ indicated their intention not to put pressure in the role play. It should be noted that experiencing real-life rudarbayesti and being exposed to the New Zealand context as an egalitarian society could influence the participants’ ideology and then their request choice; the exposure to a foreign context can have effect on their judgements or interpretations on cultural practices (see section 7.6).

Further, indirect strategies did not mention the name of the requestee ‘you’ to protect the addressee’s face. Contrary to this, Eslamiraskh’s (1993) comparative study shows using the second person pronoun rather than the first person. In the interviews, the participants claimed that requesting close friends should be made directly but the speakers’ and the addressees’ alternative examples were still most frequently conventionally indirect such as ability. The ability strategy uses the second person pronoun in Persian and expresses a direct sense as it questions the requestee.

One of the modifications to the Trosborg (1995) coding system is to include using external modifications internally, and using internal modifications externally, either preceding or coming after the request head act to delimit the linguistic realization pattern of Persian request behaviour. Compared to the external moves, fewer internal modifications were made within the request head acts. This result supports what literature found concerning the use of internal and external supportive moves. Persian preferred using external supportive moves (see also Salmani Nodoushan & Allami, 2011; Saberi, 2012).

The interviews discussed how the friendly scenario was not a place to practise taarof. It was critical for how the participants chose to express themselves in the friendship. Both the degree of closeness and the severity of request topic are important in using taarof as it could
have brought distance between close friends; therefore, the intimacy is critical in the choice not to do *taarof*. This idea is different from what Izadi (2016) discussed on *taarof* in friendly situations. In Izadi’s study, practicing *taarof* is appropriate and appreciated in some familiar and friendly contexts, but professional contexts like universities are not usually such *taarof*-like contexts.

Humility as an important principle was stated in the interviews. Using apology expressions could help lowering position and approaching modesty. In Saberi’s (2012) study, apology expressions are employed as alerters either can come before or after the request head act to soften the request.

### 7.6 LIMITATIONS

Every attempt was made to enrich this study in terms of methodology; there are, however, some limitations.

Data collection method and scenario topics in the present study had some limitations. To work around the difficulties of collecting natural corpus (such as producing sufficient request samples in a limited time and controlling contextual variables), an open role play method was employed to generate a quasi-natural conversation regarding topics with multiple turns. It creates interactional situations like real-life contexts and enables researchers to observe individuals’ pragmatic features more than a closed role play or discourse completion task (Kasper & Dahl, 1991; Gass & Houck, 1999; Félix-Brasdefer, 2010; Morkus, 2014). This was largely successful in that participants created lengthy conversations of many turns, filled in details missing from the scenarios, and took novel turns different from other conversations. Moreover, in the interviews, some participants explicitly stated that these were natural choices. However, this type of data method is not still spontaneous natural speech very well and may differ in unknown ways. One of them is that prompts designed by researchers may seem unreal to participants (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993) as interlocutors may have not been in similar contexts before like the Friends-Borrowing Money (–P–D) scenario in this study. Also, while participants talked about making different choices in different scenarios, and in fact did so, they were still pretending to be in the role and their acting may not match what they would do in reality. Moreover, some participants had actual friendly relationships, which might have affected their behaviour, in addition to pretending they had such relationships. Either
unfamiliar or familiar participants may not have produced a natural communication in their performances. An ideal future study might use all strangers or all friends to control for this. The small population of postgraduate Persian speakers in New Zealand did not allow for this.

Although this study did a pilot study on eight request topics initially to identify common academic situations that often happen in many Iranian postgraduates’ academic life, some of the participants have found the Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D) scenario as the most difficult request topic in Persian culture. So the experimental participants did treat this scenario quite differently as they found the imposition level for this scenario to be much higher than the other three, which were all somewhat similar. The main way to work around this in the present study was that no general claim was made based exclusively upon that scenario. There must be other support.

An additional possible limitation of role plays was the fact that the participants were very aware they were in a study and being observed. They spoke while being video-recorded and in the presence of the researcher. Gender differences on the researcher-participants’ interviews could be another obstacle to express the participants’ ideas comfortably in the role plays and the interviews subsequently. It should be acknowledged that the interviewees’ thoughts on their request choices in different contexts may not always have matched what they performed in the role plays.

Some limitations are inherent to the study, such as academic contexts and male gender. These were purposeful choices to control the study and allow for consistent findings, as much as possible. The variable gender had to be controlled in the current study as the population of Iranians in Dunedin and Christchurch, New Zealand where the research was carried out was fairly small, also the number of men studying and living there exceeded Iranian women at the time of data collection. Therefore, it did not allow the researcher to keep collecting data past the existing pairs. These variables could be changed in a future study, but they were a purposeful design choice. However, the sample may not entirely be representative of the larger population in Iran in several ways: by gender, by being academics, by living abroad, and by self-esteem.

Another critical limitation was that the self-esteem differences between individuals did not span the entire scale; it was from mid to high due to the limited number of postgraduate participants. This was a known limitation of the research design. The scenarios could be carefully designed to represent Power and Distance, but Self-Esteem was dependent upon the
sample. It is possible that low self-esteem individuals do not frequently find themselves as expats in postgraduate study. The study simply did not have a very large range of self-esteem values so it could affect requests more than the study could identify.

Limitations were also in interviews. Every effort was done to make the process of stimulated recall interviews similar for every single volunteer; however, as some participants shared different ideas and their real-life experiences, and brought up other relevant points in afterwards discussions, the interview procedure went differently for different individuals. They may have also felt uncomfortable in expressing their ideas on inappropriate behaviour or impoliteness. Gender differences on the participants-interviewer could have played a role in determining the participants’ thoughts. Having a joint interview session for each pair, both speaker and addressee, could also have brought some restrictions on the comments about what he or his partner did in the role plays.

7.7 CONCLUSION AND FURTHER IMPLICATIONS

There were two central innovations to the current thesis. The first was adding self-esteem as a variable of study. The second was the triangulation of research methods, approaching the study of requests from three different points of view: requests as speech acts, requests as conversations, and requests from the participants’ viewpoint. Theoretically, this study reveals the importance of the social and psychological aspects of linguistic research. In politeness research, a common historical pattern has been for a study to use one method, such as a quantitative speech act analysis, and then another study legitimately critiques that method and uses an alternate method, such as interviewing participants. A foundational idea for the current research was that each method has its own merits, and using multiple methods on the same data would give the most complete picture. Looking for patterns, researchers have typically focused on situational and sociocultural contexts as the frames of reference for interpreting speech. The importance of individual differences, particularly self-esteem for this study, in determining request choices and then interpreting politeness has been neglected.

This study was broadly in agreement with Brown and Levinson’s (1987) model in that Power and Distance had an effect on politeness choices. This was revealed through manipulation of the variables across situations and through the statements of participants
themselves without prompting. Additionally, power affected the flow of a request conversation. The requestee with more power often changed the request in the middle of the conversation and assigned work to the less powerful student by the end.

The study found that social power and distance, however, were not the only factors that influenced request forms. Individual differences also contributed to them across different educational settings. Participants also discussed the importance of concepts such as taarof, pride, humility, attitude, and more. Self-esteem was only predictive of one item in the speech act analysis, but did influence choices in conversation flow and interviews.

Moreover, putting the three methods of analysis together revealed patterns that any one analysis would have missed. For instance, the speech act analysis revealed that the “possibility” choice for a request was the most common. The interviews suggested a reason for this: To maintain the relationship, speakers wanted to give the hearer a choice. More subtly, what might appear to be a strategic choice to maximise politeness could be a consequence of some other choice. For instance, if a speaker chooses to orient a conversation towards an object or task that the hearer cares about, then using less direct requests is a natural consequence of this, not the primary choice. In a further instance, participants made more supportive moves per conversation in +Power scenarios. Which participant triggered this fact, however, is unclear, as often the requester was actually responding to questions from the requestee. One explanation then is that a requester chooses to use more supportive moves when speaking to a senior. Another explanation is that seniors ask more questions of juniors, forcing them to use more supportive moves. In order to investigate request realization, it is necessary for researchers not to consider a speech act in isolation but to examine the entire discourse aimed at making a request. This study indicated that people construct a request sequence during interactions by using not only one request head act but multiple requests along with various combinations of internal and external supportive moves.

Future research could benefit from the findings of this research which could be applied to theoretical and pedagogical issues.

This study would be helpful for teaching pragmatics to second/foreign language learners. As every culture has its own culture-specific sociolinguistic rules, language learners need to know how hierarchy and social relationships work, for example, between junior-senior or close friends in different academic situations. In other words, to know how Persian speakers perform
everyday requests can help teachers to guide students towards more native-like pragmatic behaviour and to increase cultural competence—especially for intercultural language teaching purposes. At a detailed level, the possibility strategy was the most frequent Persian request choice in the study but not directly in the Trosborg (1995) coding system. The frequency of this request choice can also be studied in further research, examining whether it can act as the possible formulation of tactful request strategy in Persian or in any other language. At a broader level, looking at a request as a conversation identified the key sort of topics and questions that must be addressed.

The study findings indicated that self-esteem can affect academic lives (see section 7.2.3); therefore, self-esteem might be seen as both a psychological variable and a determiner of pragmatic success. Evaluating individual differences of students can facilitate learning by means of the right teaching method and materials which can result in enhancement of learners’ educational performance. Therefore, the results of this research could provide insights for the methodology of foreign language teaching. Differences between speakers of different self-esteem could also become practical tips. For instance, students might be taught to focus their interactional efforts in a hierarchical situation on building their conversation partner up and not on lowering themselves. Although this study’s findings on individual differences may be perceived to have theoretical implications for pragmatic and politeness studies, perhaps there is a need for greater theoretical focus on individuals’ emotions involved in communication. The evidence to support this is from the interviews’ findings. Individual factors such as pride, humility and attitude had an important role in relation to using language (see sections 6.3.2, 6.3.3 ad 6.3.5). Therefore, it could be worthy to look at people’s feelings and emotions in relation to cultural studies.

Further research could look at domains other than academic domains such as domestic or workplace domains. Pragmatic scholars can look at other speech acts like invitations, apologies or refusals. Researchers can also work on request speech acts with other individual differences such as anxiety, self-conceptualization or self-assurance. Personality variables are always with us and we cannot leave them behind or ignore them in communications. So it can be worthy to look at other self-related variables in relation to language usage.

Some strengths of the data-gathering tools identified in this study could be helpful for further research. The enriched role play technique used in the study enabled gathering a number of quasi-normal conversations with similar contextual features. More importantly, this method could help
in analyzing the full request conversation across different contexts. Video-recording the role plays was very useful and necessary for the interviews. Discursive studies could benefit from interview discussions through showing videos of participants’ performances. However, having the facilities to install one camera to take both speakers in one frame could be better for multimodal analysis. The stimulated recall interview was also very inspiring as several ideas and thoughts were discussed, which focused more on some other individual differences like first impressions, welcoming, sense of humor and personality type.
REFERENCES


Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.


APPENDICES
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UNIVERSITY OF OTAGO HUMAN ETHICS COMMITTEE APPLICATION FORM: CATEGORY A

Dear Dr Hatfield,

I am again writing to you concerning your proposal "psychopragmatic predictors of request behaviour in Pers English", Ethics Committee reference number 15/133.

Thank you for your response of 23rd October 2015 addressing Committee.

On the basis of this response, I am pleased to confirm that the prc approval to proceed.

Approval is for up to three years from the date of this letter. If completed within three years from the date of this letter, re-appro the nature, consent, location, procedures or personnel of your app please advise me in writing.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
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28 October 2015

Making Requests Using Your Language

Information Sheet for Participants

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part, there will be no disadvantage to you and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the aim of the project?

- The purpose of this research project is to investigate how Persian speakers and New Zealand participants whose native language is English make requests in different situations, looking at factors such as the relationship between the participants and an individual’s self-esteem.
- The study will contribute to our understanding of similarities and differences between request strategies across two languages, Persian and New Zealand English.
- This project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for a PhD in Linguistics.

Who may participate in the project?

- 40 Persian male postgraduates and 40 New Zealand male postgraduates whose native language is English.
- Any male participants studying any discipline in New Zealand are welcome.
- Participants must be between 18 and 50 years old.
Participation is entirely voluntary. After submitting your contribution, you will receive a small gift (coffee/grocery voucher) as a thank you present.

What will you be asked to do?

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to…

- Engage in brief role plays with another speaker in your native language.
- Imagine yourself in real positions and interact with your interlocutor.
- It is estimated all role plays will take under 20 minutes.
- After the role plays, the researcher will ask you questions about the role play.
- Fill out a self-esteem questionnaire with contact and background information.
- Participation in the data-collection process is voluntary. This process is not intended to cause you any risk, discomfort or inconvenience. You are free to withdraw from the project at any stage. You will not be disadvantaged in any way if you do either of these things.

What data or information will be collected and what use will be made of it?

- Role play situations will be videotaped.
- Self-esteem will be estimated with a brief questionnaire.
- The purpose of the study is to bring a better understanding of similarities and differences between request strategies across Persian and New Zealand English.
- The project is not related to participants’ identity or an evaluation in any way.
- Personal information (e.g. contact details) will be collected for administrative purposes. This information will be destroyed at the completion of the project.
- Background information (e.g., age, educational background) will be collected in order to make anonymous generalizations about the pool of participants.
- Only the researcher, supervising professor, and Head of Department will have access to the video tape, the data and personal information.
- Data from this study will be securely stored in the supervising professor’s office for a minimum of five years after completion of the study and will be destroyed after that.
- Aggregate results of all information will appear in the researchers’ PhD thesis and possible journal articles. Videos of participants will never be shown to others. If any mention is made of individual self-esteem scores in such articles, the score will be presented anonymously and any identifying information in speech samples will be removed.
What if I have further questions?

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

Mrs Azar Mirzaei OR Dr Hunter Hatfield
Linguistics Programme, Linguistics Programme,
Department of English Department of English
University of Otago University of Otago
Email: miraz430@student.otago.ac.nz Email: hunter.hatfield@otago.ac.nz
Departmental phone: +64 3 479 6375 Office phone: +64 3 479 9087

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome. The whole thing should be edited down to two pages total. It’s hard to tell if we are there now or not. You will know after accepting changes.
Appendix C: Participant Consent Form

15/133

28 October 2015

Making Requests Using Your Language

Consent Form for Participants

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. Personal identifying information will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years. Electronic data and communications cannot be guaranteed to be private but every effort will be made to ensure they are;

3. I will be asked to engage in brief conversational role plays with another speaker in my native language, NZ English or Persian. These conversations will be videotaped. I will also be asked questions about my role plays. I will also be asked to fill out a self-esteem questionnaire with contact and background information;

4. This process is not intended to cause you any risk, discomfort or inconvenience. You are free to withdraw from the project at any stage. You will not be disadvantaged in any way if you do withdraw;

5. After finishing role plays and self-esteem questionnaire, I will receive a small gift as a token of thanks for my contribution to the project;

6. Results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand). Every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity;

I agree to take part in this project.
This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
سناریو اول: استاد- تمدید مهلت (+قدرت +فاحش)

گوینده
فرض کنید که دانشجویی ۲۴ ساله در مقطع کارشناسی ارشد دانشگاه مشغول به تحصیل می‌باشید. در انتخاب واحد سال دوم، شما درس ارائه شده توسط یکی از استادان مسن و مجبور را انتخاب نموده‌اید. برای این درس شما با استادی پروزه تان را تا پایان ترم به وی تحول دهید، اما مطمن نشینید که قادر به ارسال به موقع نیستید و تحول ندادن پروزه تان بر نمره پایان ترم شما تاثیر می‌گذارد. علی رغم اینکه با استادتان ارتباط نزدیکی ندارید، اما تصمیم می‌گیرید تا به دفتر کار استادان در دانشگاه مراجعه و تقاضای تمدید مهلت ارسال پروزه نمایید.

لطفاً در طبیعی ترین حالت ممکن این نقش را اجرا کنید.

1

مخاطب
فرض کنید شما یک استاد مسن و مjobر هستید که واحدهای متکانی را برای دانشجویان تحصیلات تکمیلی دریافت می‌کنید. طبق معمول، شما انتظار دارید پروزه‌های تحصیلاتی دانشجویان را به موقع دریافت کنید. یکی از دانشجویان مرد شما که ۲۴ ساله است وقت قبلی گرفته‌است در مورد پروزه اش با شما صحبت کند. در ضمن، شما وی را خوب نمی‌شناسید.

لطفاً به طور طبیعی به سخنران دیگر پاسخ دهید.

1
بی‌خودی 
تصور کنید که به عنوان دانشجوی کارشناسی ارشد به عنوان مشکل خانوادگی با چهار هفته تأخیر پس از شروع ترم موفق به ثبت نام شده اید. برخی از جلسه‌های کلاس درس را از دست داده اید. اما برای امتحان پایان سال به تمام جزوات نیاز دارید.
همچنین، شما هیچ یک از همکلاسی‌هایتان را که هم سن و سال خودتان هستند را نمی‌شناسید. بالاخره، یکی از همکلاسی‌هایتان تمام جزوات را دارد. بعد از کلاس، از وی می‌خواهید تا جزوات درسی را برای چند ساعت به شما قرض دهد تا آنها را کپی نمایید.
هرچند که شما با وی آشنا نیستید.
لطفا در طبیعی‌ترین حالت ممکن این نقش را اجرا کنید.

مخاطب 
شما دانشجوی کارشناسی ارشد هستید و از هر آنچه در کلاس‌ها درس می‌دهند، هر چه بیشتر پی سازید. بعد از گذرش چهار هفته، یک هم ورودی جدید به گروه شما اضافه شده که وی را از نزدیکی نمی‌شناسید. او هم سن و سال شما است و بعد از کلاس، او به شما نزدیک می‌شود.
لطفا در طبیعی‌ترین حالت ممکن این نقش را اجرا کنید.
سناریو سوم: دوست، بول قرض گرفتن (وقدرت - خاصه)

کوئنده

 تصویر کنید که دانشجوی دکتری ۲۰ ساله هستید. شما و دوست صمیمیتان که هم سن شماست در این ترم تحصیلی در یک خوابگاه زندگی می کنید. شما هزینه خوابگاه را ماهانه از پیش می پردازید. اما از انجایی که حقوق ماهیانه بورسیه تحصیلی را هنوز دریافت نکرده اید، لذا پول کافی برای پرداخت هزینه این ماه خوابگاه را ندارید. شما قصد دارید از دوستتان پولی بخواهید تا این مبلغ را به شما قرض بدهد. مطمئنا شما آن مبلغ را تا انتهای ماه یا زودتر (به محض دریافت حقوق) به وی باز می گردانید. شما تا کجا خود را بعد از صرف شام در خوابگاه مطرح می کنید؟

لطفا در طبیعی ترین حالات ممکن این نوشته را اجرا کنید.

مخاطب

 تصویر کنید که دانشجوی دکتری ۲۰ ساله هستید. شما و دوست صمیمیتان که هم سن شماست در این ترم تحصیلی در یک خوابگاه زندگی می کنید. شما هزینه خوابگاه را ماهانه از پیش می پردازید.

بعد از صرف شام در خوابگاه، دوست شما در مورد موضوع م مهم با شما صحبت می کند.

لطفا در طبیعی ترین حالات ممکن این نوشته را اجرا کنید.
سناریو چهارم: مسئول آموزش- صحبت درباره هزینه پژوهشی (+اقدرت- فاصله)

گوینده
فرض کنید دانشجوی سال سوم دوره دکتری هستید و تقریبا 33 سال دارید. شما به عنوان دانشجوی سختکوش در حال انجام یک پروژه تحقیقاتی هستید و برای تکمیل به موقع آن به کمک هزینه پژوهشی (گرنت پژوهشی) نیاز دارید. از اینرو، قصد دارید که با مسئول آموزش گروه که فردی حدودا 54 سال است، صحبت کنید. چند سالی است او را می‌شناسید و ارتباط نزدیکی با وی دارید. به دفتر وی رفته و تقاضای خود را با وی مطرح می‌کنید.

لطفاً در طبیعی ترین حالت ممکن این نقش را اجرا کنید.

4

مطابق
در نظر گرفتگی که مسئول آموزش گروهی در دانشگاه هستید و حدودا 45 سال دارید. دانشجویان تحصیل‌کننده تکمیل معمولا درخواست‌های خود برای کمک هزینه پژوهشی به شما ارسال می‌کنند. یکی از دانشجویان سال سوم دوره دکتری که تقریبا 33 سال دارد در اتاق شما را می‌زند. چند سالی است که او را می‌شناسید و ارتباط نزدیکی با وی دارد.

لطفاً در طبیعی ترین حالت ممکن این نقش را اجرا کنید.

4
سناریو تمرینی اول: استاد- تشکر بابت قرض دادن کتاب (+قدرت + فاصله)

گوینده
تصور کنید که دانشجویی 25 ساله هستید و در مقطع کارشناسی ارشد مشغول به تحصیل هستید. شما مسئول به ارسال پروژه خود تا آخر ترم تحصیلی هستید. اما نتوانسته اید منابع مفید و مرتبط را پیدا کنید. استاد مجری گروه شما، چند منبع مفید معرفی کرد و همچنین چند جلد کتاب مرتبط را برای سه هفته به شما قرض داده است. هرچند که او را برای مدت طولانی نمی شناسید، امروز می خواهد به دفتر کارش بروید تا کتابها را به وی باز گردانید و از او تشکر کنید.

لطفا در طبیعی ترين حالت ممكن اين نقش را اجرا كنيد.

تمرينی I

مخاطب
در نظر بگيريد كه استاد مجری و با سابقه دانشگاه هستيد و دروس مختلفی را برای دانشجویان تحصیلات تکمیلی درس مي كنيد. دانشجویان شما معمولا برای چگونگي انجام پروژه های پرورش هایشان بدون نياز به وقت قبلی به دفتر شما مراجعه مي كنند. شما قبلي چند منبع مفید به يکي از دانشجویان كارشناسی ارشد كه مردي حدودا 25 ساله است معرفی كرده اید. و همچنین چند كتاب را برای مدت سه هفته به او قرض داده ايد. از حال آمدن به دفتر شما است تا با شما صحبت كنند. مدت كوتاهی است که او را مي شناسد.

لطفا در طبیعی ترين حالت ممكن اين نقش را اجرا كنيد.

تمرينی I
سناریو تمرینی دوم: دوست- تشکر بابت قرض دادن لپ تاپ (نکته- فصل 7)

گوینده

تصور کنید که دانشجوی دکتری ۳۰ ساله هستید. شما و دوست صمیمیتان که هم سن شماست در این ترم تحصیلی در یک خوابگاه زندگی می‌کنید. امروز صبح لپ تاپ شما کاملاً از کار افتاده است و شما برای اتمام کار خود لپ تاپ دوستتان را بسیار می‌خواهید. لپ تاپ را به وی بدهید و از وی تشکر کنید.

لطفا در طبیعی ترین حالت ممکن این نقش را اجرا کنید.

تمرينی 2

مخاطب

تصور کنید که دانشجوی دکتری ۳۰ ساله هستید. شما و دوست صمیمیتان که هم سن شماست در این ترم تحصیلی در یک خوابگاه زندگی می‌کنید. امروز صبح دوست شما برای اتمام کار لپ تاپ را از شما قرض گرفته است. هم‌اکنون در یک خوابگاه هستید و او می‌خواهد با شما صحبت کند.

لطفا در طبیعی ترین حالت ممکن این نقش را اجرا کنید.

تمرينی 2
Scenario 1: Professor-Extension (+P+D)

**Speaker’s role**

Imagine that you are a 24 year-old student studying for a Master degree in another city, far from your hometown. In the second year of your study, you have enrolled for a paper taught by a senior, distinguished professor. You are required to submit an essay by the end of the semester but you are sure that you will miss the submission deadline and therefore fail the class. You have made an appointment to go to your professor’s office at the university and will ask for an extension, although you do not know him very well.

Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.

1

**Addressee’s role**

Imagine that you are a senior, distinguished professor teaching different papers/subjects for postgraduates at the university. As usual, you would like to receive the students’ essays on the due date. One of your students who is a 24 year-old man has made an appointment to talk about his essay. You do not know him very well.

Please respond naturally in this role to the other speaker.

1
Scenario 2: Classmates-Borrowing Notes (−P+D)

Speaker’s role

Imagine that you have enrolled as an MA student after four weeks the semester has just begun due to a family issue. You have missed some sessions of your classes, but you need class notes for the final exams. You do not know any of your classmates very well, although most are the same age as you. Finally, you find a classmate who has taken notes in all classes. After lecture, ask him to lend you his class notes for a couple of hours to photocopy them, although you are not close to this classmate.

Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.

2

Addressee’s role

Imagine that you are an MA student who always take notes in all classes. One of your classmates whom you do not know very well started his study at your department four weeks later. He is the same age as you. After lecture, he approaches you.

Please respond naturally in this role to the other speaker.

2
**Scenario 3: Friends-Borrowing Money (−P−D)**

**Speaker’s role**

Imagine that you are a thirty year-old PhD student. You and your close friend, who is the same age as you, are staying together in a university college this semester. You pay the accommodation charges monthly in advance; however, because payments from your scholarship have not begun, you do not yet have the money to pay. You want your friend to lend you this money. You will definitely return it by end of the month or earlier once you receive the scholarship allowance. After dinner in the flat, you ask.

Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.

3

**Addressee’s role**

Imagine that you are a thirty year-old PhD student. You and your close friend, who is the same age as you, are staying together in a university college this semester. You pay the accommodation charges monthly in advance. After dinner in the flat, you friend talks about something important.

Please respond naturally in this role to the other speaker.

3
**Scenario 4: Manager-Checking an Application (+P–D)**

**Speaker’s role**

Imagine that you are a thirty three year-old PhD student in the third year of studying. You are a hardworking student and are currently working on a research project that is due soon in which you need a research grant to complete your article. So you think you should talk to your departmental manager who is around 45 years old to assist you in this regard. You have known him for a couple of years and also have a close relationship with him. So you go to his office to ask about this.

Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.

**Addressee’s role**

Imagine that you are a 45 year-old departmental manager at a university. Postgraduates usually submit their applications for research grants to you. One of the PhD students who is thirty three years old in the third year of his study knocks on your office door. You have known him for a couple of years and have a close relationship with him.

Please respond naturally in this role to the other speaker.
Scenario Training 1: Professor-Thanking for lending some books (+P+D)

Speaker’s role

Imagine that you are a 25 year-old student studying for a Master degree. You are required to submit an assignment by the end of the semester but you could not find helpful, relevant resources. Your senior professor introduced some helpful resources and lent you a few relevant books for 3 weeks. Today you want to return the books to his office and thank him, although you do not know him very well.

Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.

Training 1

Addressee’s role

Imagine that you are a senior professor teaching different papers/subjects for postgraduates at a university. Your students usually come to your office to ask about assignments or essays without any prior appointment. You already introduced some helpful resources and also lent some relevant books to one of your MA students who is a 25 year-old man for 3 weeks. He is coming to your office to speak to you. You do not know him very long.

Please respond naturally in this role to the other speaker.

Training 1
Scenario Training 2: Friend-Thanking for lending laptop (−P−D)

Speaker’s role

Imagine that you are a PhD student. You and your close friend, who is the same age as you (30 years old), are staying together in a university college this semester. This morning your laptop was totally broken and you borrowed your friend’s laptop to finish your work for a couple of hours.

Now you want to return the laptop and thank him.

Please act out such a conversation as naturally as possible.

Training 2

Addressee’s role

Imagine that you are a PhD student. You and your close friend, who is the same age as you (30 years old), are staying together in a university college this semester. This morning your friend’s laptop was totally broken and he borrowed your laptop to finish his work for a couple of hours. Now you both are in the flat and he wants to speak to you.

Please respond naturally in this role to the other speaker.

Training 2
Appendix F: Transcriptions of All Professor-Extension (+P+D) Role Plays along with Translations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HH</td>
<td><strong>Gooyande:</strong> tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad), salam ostad.&lt;br&gt;Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door), hello Professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mokhatab:</strong> salam befarma.&lt;br&gt;A: Hello, come in please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>G:</strong> ejaze hast biam dakhel?&lt;br&gt;S: May I come in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M:</strong> befarma.&lt;br&gt;A: Please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>G:</strong> mmm mibakhshid ostad mozahemeton shodam. Eee dashtid mashghole karam bodino ina {sorfe} mikhastam azaton ye khaheshi boke hame aneke hame hame hame hame shoma ghabalanam gofie bodin, elamam karde bodin ke ta {mokhatab mipare vasat}&lt;br&gt;S: Umm Sorry Prof, I disturbed you. Err You are busy, you were working {coughing} I wanted to request you if it would be possible that I haven’t been able to complete my project yet and I know you’ve already noted that until {interrupted by the addressee}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 مخاطب: سلام بفرما.

3 گ: اجازه است بیام داخل؟

4 م: بفرما.

5 گ: مم میبخشید استاد مزاحمین شدم اگر باشید مشغول کارم بودین و اینا {سرفه} میخواستم ازتون یه خواهشی بکنم اگه امکان داشت به شما با بروز اپوزام را آماده بکن و با اینکه شما قبلین گفتی بودین اعلام کرده بودین که تا {مخاطب میبره وسط}

6 م: کدام درس رو شما با من دارین؟
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06 M: kodoom dars ro shoma ba man darin?</td>
<td>A: Which course did you take with me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 G: I have ‘madar manteghi 2’ (ESM-e VAHED-e Darsi)</td>
<td>S: I have ‘Logic circuit 2’ (COURSE’s NAME).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 M: agha-ye?</td>
<td>A: Mr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 G: man ‘ESM’ hastam</td>
<td>S: I am ‘FIRST NAME’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 M: kelasa ro be moghe miyayn shoma? Ghiyafe shoma {aheste: be nazar ashna nemiyad.}!</td>
<td>A: Are you attending the classes regularly? Your face {quietly: not so much familiar to me}!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 G: kelasa ro monazam miyomadam ostad monteha...</td>
<td>S: I have attended classes regularly, Professor but…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 G: ممکن است درسمند یا دانشجوی، در آخرین روزهای دوره آموزشی، به بهترین نحوه حل مسئله نشان می‌دهد.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 G: mmm fekr mikonan payan termam ro khoob neveshte basham. Monteha, hanoz forsat nakardam ke kamel eee poroje ro tahvil amade bokonam va tahvil-e shoma bedam.</td>
<td>S: Umm I think I did well in the final exam, but I haven’t found any chance to complete err the project and submit it to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 M: ta key mikhayn shoma tahvil bedin?</td>
<td>A: Until when do you want to submit [it]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 G: chon term 2 ham ast, sal-e dovomam hastim ye meghdar hajm-e kara {مخاطب میره وسط}</td>
<td>S: Because we are in the second [academic] semester, we are in the second year of the study, the amount of work {interrupted by the addressee}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 M: shoma daneshjooein. Bayad be moghe... kar-e dige-ei ke nadarin; bayad be moghe karatono anjam bedin. Aslan az vijegihay-e daneshjoo in-e ke karasho be moghe anjam bede va sar-e vaght porojasho tahvil dade bashe va baray-e chi? Shoma ke kar-e dige-ei nadarin. Baray-e chi vaght-e ezafi mikhayn?</td>
<td>A: You are a student. [You] Must be on time. You don’t have anything else to do. You must do your work on time. One of the features of a student is to do his work on time and to submit his project at the due time. And for what? You don’t have to do anything else, what do you want extension for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 G: hagh ba shomast ostad; kamelan ham dorost migin. Monteha chon ma sal-e dovom hastim, darsay-e dige ham bod. Ye meghdar feshar-e kari, makhsoosan payan term ziyad boode. Mikhastam ke age beshe, faghat ye hafte dige be ma forsat bedin ke man betoonam in poroje ro amade bokonam {مخاطب میره وسط}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: You’re right, Professor; you are completely right. But because we’re in the second year of the study, there are also other courses to study. And we were under pressure a little to study other subjects, too, particularly there have been many final exams. I wondered if it’d be possible to give us a chance only one more week that I can finish this project {interrupted by the addressee}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 M: من فقط میتونم نهایتا تا پس فردا به شما فرصت بدم؛ تا پس فردا برام بیاریش.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: I can just give you two more days extension at maximum. Turn it in by the day after tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 G: استاد، تا پس فردا؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Professor, till the day after tomorrow?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 M: دیگه حداقل ش. من به دانشجو هیچ وقت همچین...چون من که معتقدم شما باید کارتونو به موقع انجام بدهین، اما درستونو باید به موقع بخونین، پروژشنون...یه مدت طولانی وقت داشتنه که اینکارو انجام بدهین. من بیشتر از دو روز نمیتونم به شما فرصت بدم.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: This is the maximum [time]. I never give a student such [extension]…because I do believe you must do your work at the due time, err you should study on time, your project...[you] had plenty of time to work on your project. I can’t give you the extension more than 2 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 G: استاد، من کل کارو تقیبا انجام دادم فقط یکی از کار داکیومنت کردش مونده ولی خب اونم حداقل یک هفته مخاطب بپید وسط {mokhatab mipare vasat}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Professor, I’ve almost done the work. The documentation is just left, but well, it takes one week at least {interrupted by the addressee}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 M: کاری نداره شما بشن. نه دیگر کاری نداره شما امشب و فردا بشن اونا رو انجام بدين. کار زیادی فکر نمیکنم داشته باشه.

23 G: من تمام تلاشم میکنم ولی اگه احيانا {چشمک میزنه} مثلا حالا تا سه چهار روزم طول کشید، خواهش میکنم که اجازه بدهید من تا {پرید وسط}{میکنم که اجازه بدهید من تا} {برادر اینستا} میکنم که اجازه بدهید من تا {میکنم که اجازه بدهید من تا} {میکنم که اجازه بدهید من تا}

24 M: نهايتا چند شنبه شما ميتونيد برا من بياريدش؟ تا کي؟

25 G: من همين الان شروع بكنم به نوشتن، فكر ميكنم که تا چهارشنبه بعد از ظهر بتونم براتون ايمل بکنم اگه اشكال نداشت باشه؟

26 M: چهارشنبه بعد ظهر آخرين فرصت كه من ميتوانم به شما بدم.

27 G: mamnoon ostad. Kheyli lotf kardid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S: Thank you Professor. I do appreciate it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 M: befarma.

A: No worries.

29 G: dastetoon dard nakone.

S: Thank you.

30 M: khahesh mikonam.

A: You’re welcome.

31 G: thank you. Khodahafez-e shoma.

S: Thank you. Good bye to you.

32 M: Khoda negahdar.

A: Good bye.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>HH</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 01   | **Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).**  
Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door).  

02 **Mokhatab: befarmaein.**  
Addressee: Come in please.  

03 **G: salam ostad, khaste nabashin.**  
S: Hello Professor.  

04 **M: salam, kahesh mikonam. Ghorbane shoma.**  
A: Hello, most welcome.  

05 **G: bebakhshid man mozahemeton shodam.**  
S: I am sorry that I disturbed you.  

06 **M: ekhtiyar darin.**  
A: No worries.  

07 **G: sharmande. Age khatereton bashe, man ‘Karto Digital’ (ESM-e VAHED-e Darsi) bahaton dashtam.**  
S: Excuse me. If you recall, I have ‘Carto Digital’ (COURSE’s NAME) with you.  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>M: bale bale agha-ye?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Yes, Yes. Mr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>G: ESM' hastam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S:</td>
<td>I’m ‘FIRST NAME’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>‘FIRST NAME’. Yes, Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M: فقط مسئله ای که هست آقای دکتر، من نتونستم تمومش بکنم پروژه رو و فکر میکنم کار داره. واقعیت اینه که یک کمی 11.1 گرفتار بودم و نشده جمعش یکم. حالا چیزی که هست نمره اش هم خیلی مهمه. میخواستم ببینیم اگه امکان داشته باشه یا به تاخیر بگیرم از خدمتون تقاضا کنم.

G: There is only an issue, Professor, I couldn’t finish my project and I think it needs more work. The truth is that I was err stuck a bit and couldn’t get it done. Well, the thing is that its mark is really important. I wondered if it’d be possible to submit my project with a delay.

A: Do you think what your problem was that you had this delay? Does that mean you couldn’t spend enough time or is the project itself time-demanding?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 G:</td>
<td>والایا یه قسمت مطالعاتی داشت که من نرسیدم زیاد مطالعه بکنم. بخاطر این تو پروسه کار هی گیر کرم، در حقيقة هر دو تاش اتفاق افتاده.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


S: The truth is that I did not spend enough time to study properly. I was then stuck in the process of the work. Indeed, both of them happened. |

| 14 M: | اوهوم. |

14 M: oohoom. |

A: Aha. |

| 15 G: | و اگه بتونم مثلا یه دو هفته دیگه وقت داشته باشم؛ نمیدونم حالا شما کی مخواهی نمره ها رو نامیک. |

15 G: va age betoonam masalan ye 2 hafte dige vaght dashte basham; nemidoonam hala shoma key mikhayn nomre ha ro taeid bokonin. |

S: If I can have two more weeks; I don’t now know when you want to finalise the marks. |

| 16 M: | راستش رو بخوای آره، چون من باید بارگه ها رو تحویل بدم و نمر ها رو وارد سایت بکنم. میدونید که، ما هم دماوندی داریم. |

16 M: rastesh ro bekhay are. Chon man bayad bargeha ro tahvil bedam va nomreha ro vared-e sayt bokonam. Midoonid ke, ma ham deadline darim. |

A: The truth is that yes. I have to send the papers back and to finalise (to submit) the marks. You know that, we have the deadline, too. |

| 17 G: | بله. |

17 G: bale. |

S: Yes. |

| 18 M: | چقدر تا مکث مه؟ |

18 M: ke daneshgah rooy-e oon kheli hasas hastesh. Banabarin eee 2 hafte ke {maks} cheghadr ta alan pishraft kardi? |
Pairs | Role Play Conversations
--- | ---
A: that, it is very important to the university, so err 2 weeks {pause} how much progress have you had so far?

19 G: 60% poroje taghriban.
S: Roughly 60% of the project.

20 م: 60% khob khoob-e. Fekr nemikonam 2 hafte age vaghtet azad bashe, fekr mikonam mitoni ke to kamtar az 2 hafte anjamesh bedi?! Alaayohal shoma talasheto bokon.
A: Well, 60% is good. I don’t think 2 weeks, if you have free time, I think you can do it in less than 2 weeks?! However, do your best.

21 G: dorost-e.
S: Right.

22 M: va hafte bad yani say kon ta oonjaeike mitoni dast-e por biyay. Hafte bad biya, yani yek hafte chon man dige taghriban hafte bad ya hala hasht noh roz dige.
A: And come next week with a full hand as much as you can. Come next week, it means one week because I [have to finalise them] approximately next week or 8-9 days later.

23 G: sahih.
S: Right.

24 M: bayad nomre ha ro vared konim. Banabar, A: Have to finalise the marks. Therefore,
### Role Play Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Conversation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>G: bale S: Yes</td>
<td>گ: بله. ش: یا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ج: دیگه تا هفته بعد میتونی نهایتا منتظر باشم. ش: بیا بهام این کارتو نگاه میکنیم. A: I'll be waiting until the next week, the maximum. Come then, we can look at your project together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>G: bashe. S: Okay.</td>
<td>گ: باشه. ش: یا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ج: من دقیقا حالا خود نتیجه رو مند نظرم نیست. ولی اگه یک حاال به یه حد قابل قبولی رسد بود میتونیم بهم ... A: I am not fussy about the precise results but if you can make the project to some acceptable extent, we can together …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>G: dast-e shoma dard nakone. Man khedmateton pas tamas migiram. S: Appreciate it. I'll contact you then.</td>
<td>گ: دست شما درد نکمه. من خدمتتون پس تامس میگیرم. ش: متشکرم</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Role Play Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>31 G:</strong> motshakeram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32 M:</strong> khoshhal shodam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Glad to see you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G:</strong> khodanegahdar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33 M:</strong> khodanegahdar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34 M:</strong> salam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Hello</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3

|  
| **HL** |  
| **01 Gooyande:** tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad). |  
| Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door). |  
| **02 M:** befarmaeid. |  
| A: Come on in. |  
| **03 G:** salam agha-ye doctor. |  
| S: Hello Mr. Dr. |  
| **04 M:** salam. |  
| A: Hello |  

---

32: م: خوشحال شدم.
33: گ: خدانگهدار.
34: م: خدانگهدار.
4: م: سلام.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05 G: khaste nabashid.</td>
<td>G: خسته نباشید.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: This expression does not exist in English. Many conversations are generally started with this caring expression which looks polite.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 M: hal-e shoma? Khoob hastin shoma?</td>
<td>M: حال شما؟ خوب هستین شما؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: How are you? Are you fine?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 G: mitoona ye chand daghighe mozahemeton besham?</td>
<td>G: میتوونم یه چند دقیقه مزاحمتون بشم؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Can I disturb you for a few minutes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Yes, go ahead please. I’m at your service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 G: kheyli mamnoon. Mitoonam beshinam?</td>
<td>G: خیلی ممنون. میتوونم بشینم؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Thank you very much. Can I take a seat?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Yes, of course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Thanks. How are you Mr Dr?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 G: man daneshjoo-ye kelase ravesh tahghighetoon hastam age khateretoon bashe.</td>
<td>S: I am your student in your ‘Methodology’ class if you recall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 G: are shoma saretoon shoolooghe.</td>
<td>S: Yes, you are busy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 M: esmetoon ro age begid man shayad...?</td>
<td>A: If you tell me your name, maybe I…?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 G: tahe kelas mamoolan.
S: Usually at the back of the class.

20 M: hamoon saro seda \{labkhand\}
A: That noise and \{smile\}

21 G: \{labkhand\} are bebakshid be har hal.
S: \{smile\} Yes. Sorry anyway.

22 M: khahesh mikonam.
A: No problem.

23 G: zende bashin.
S: Long life to you.

24 M: na befarmaeid.
A: No. Please go ahead.

25 G: \{labkhand\} eee man rastesh ham mikhastam khedmatetoon beresam arze adab bokonam,
S: err the truth is that I wanted to greet you,

26 M: mersi.
A: Thanks.
27 G: va mmm rastesh ye moshkel-e kochiki hast, goftam ba khodetoon mashverat konam.
S: And umm also there is a little problem that I wanted to consult it with you.

28 M: bale.
A: Yes.
S: Because indeed, I go to work, err and I know very well [that] you emphasised that projects should be submitted at the due time at the beginning of the semester.

30 M: bale bale. Man midoonid ke man ro zamanhaye poroje ye kam... 
A: Yes, yes. You know that [submission date] deadline of the projects a bit {interrupted by the speaker for confirmation}

S: Right. No.

32 M: hasas hastam.
A: are important to me (I give importance to).

33 G: من میخواستم بینم چون من سرکار می‌مرم، یه مقدار از شهرستان میامو میرم و اینا، آیا امکانش است من یه هفته با تأخیر بتونم پروره ام رو براتون ارسال کنم؟
Pairs  |  Role Play Conversations
--- | ---
33  |  G: man mikhastam bebinam chon man sar-e kar miram, ye meghdaram az shahrestanam miyamo miram va ina, ayaaa emkanesh hast man ye hafte ba takhir betoonam porojam ro baratooon ersal konam?
34  |  M: ببين من معمولا اول هر ترم...تو خودتون ميدونيد دقيقا مشخص ميکنم كه چطوری بايد در چه زمانهایی...و كه اين وقت به دانشجوهام بدم.
35  |  G: bale.
36  |  M: chon midooni man kelasaye mokhtalefi daram, age bekhad chiz beshe, daneshjooha bi nazmi konan in aghab biyofte, kollan kar-e manam chiz mishe. Eee kar-e shoma...? Shoma moteahel hastid? Ya ...
37  |  G: na man moteahel nistam. Vali be har hal majbooram kar bokonam baray-e ke betoonam tahsil bokonam.
38  |  M: اوهوم. كدم شهر شما میرید؟
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 M: <strong>oohoom. Kodoom shahr shoma mirid?</strong></td>
<td>A: Aha. Which city are you from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 G: <strong>man az ‘ESM-e SHAHR’ miram.</strong></td>
<td>S: I come from ‘CITY’s NAME’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 گ: من از ‘اسم شهر’ می‌روم.</td>
<td>40 M: <strong>mirid hamoon…dar rafio amad hastin.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 گ: من از ‘اسم شهر’ می‌روم.</td>
<td>A: So you have to come and go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 G: <strong>bale. Khob midoonid ke khabgah ham be ma taalogh nagereft in term.</strong></td>
<td>S: Yes. Well you know, there was not a room available for me in dormitory (college) this semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 گ: بنهم هرکدام می‌دانید که خوابگاه‌ها این ترم جا به جای وای.</td>
<td>42 M: <strong>ahan shoma majboor hastin...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 گ: چون ما نیم ترم دوم بودیم، جا به جای وای.</td>
<td>A: Aha. You have to…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 گ: چون ما نیم ترم دوم بودیم، جا به جای وای.</td>
<td>43 G: <strong>chon ma nim term-e dovom boodim, khabgah taalogh nagereft. Ye meghdar sharayet-e man bad shod vagheiyatesh. Hala man nemikham tojih bokonam valiken sharayet injoori shod yekam.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 گ: چون ما نیم ترم دوم بودیم، جا به جای وای.</td>
<td>S: Because I am in the second semester, I was not eligible for booking a room in the dormitory (college). It actually made my situation bad. Well, I don’t want to justify it but my situation has been like this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 M: <strong>shoma miyan term-e avvalet chand shodi? Man...</strong></td>
<td>44 گ: شما می‌دانید ترم اولت چند شده؟ من...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A: What was your first mid-term exam score? I...

45 G: man az 5, 2.5 shodam.
S: I’ve got 2.5 out of 5.

46 M: dorost-e.
A: Right.

47 G: oon moghe rastesh naresidam kheyli.
S: Indeed, I could not study [for it] pretty well at that time.

48 M: inja ham labe marz boodi dar vaghe. Mmm rastesh che komaki mitoonam man be shoma bokonam? Yani vaghean yek hafte bishtar vaght, shoma fekr mikond ke yek pishraft, yek taghir-e ziyadi dar...?
A: In fact, you were between. Umm how can I help you? I mean do you think that one more week can make a big change, considerable progress in...?

S: Yes, because I would like to be off for a week and sit to complete the project if it’d be possible. It doesn’t mean that I haven’t started yet. I’ve worked on it, collected the data and also talked about it with other guys, but I know I can’t finish it [by the deadline]. If
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you say to turn it in, I would do that but it’s an incomplete piece to me. It’s not very [good].</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 م: من کمکی که میتونم به شما بکنم اگه واقعا فکر میکنی بپیشرفتی توش کار شما حاصل بشه تا این یک هفته، ایرادی نداره.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 M: man komaki ke mitoonam be shoma bokonam age vaghean fekr mikoni pishrafte to kar-e shoma hasel beshe to in yek hafte, iradi nadare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: What I can help you if you think seriously that you would make progress in your work in one more week, not a problem.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 G: dastetoon dard nakone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Thank you very much.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 M: vali intor nabashe ke dobare...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: But it shouldn’t be like that again…</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 G: na na na.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: No, no, no.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 M: bade yek hafte dobare biyay vaght-e mojadad begiri.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: after a week, come again and get an extra extension.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 G: na na.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: No, no.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 م: یا یه چیز ناقص بخواید تحول بدين.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 M: ya ye chiz-e naghies bekhayd tahvil bedid.</td>
<td>A: Or you want to submit an incomplete work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 G: na na, ghol midam. Na dastetoon...</td>
<td>S: No, no, I promise. No, thanks…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 M: ya ye hamchin halati bashe.</td>
<td>A: Or something like this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 G: na ghol midam in etefagh nayofte. Hatman-e hatman ye gozaresh-e khoob beheton midam. Age shoma in mohabat bokonid, man hatman anjamesh midam.</td>
<td>S: No, I promise this wouldn’t happen. I do turn in a good report. If you do this favour, I would do it for sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 M: faghat ye noktei hastesh ke be daneshjooye digi nagid.</td>
<td>A: There is just a point that don’t tell/share this to/with other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 M: ke hamchin vaghti hast.</td>
<td>A: That there is such extension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
63G: chashm.
S: Okay.

A: I want you to make a serious change in this one-week extension.

64 M: va azatoon mikhaym ke vaghean taghiri ijad beshe to in yek hafte.

S: Okay. I try my hardest. The truth is that the score 2.5 that I got for my mid-term exam was due to both commuting and not spending proper time on studying because of the job. I do work on it. I promise that I get a good score from you.


66 M: hatman. Ma ham be har hal khastemoon ham...

S: Okay. Anyway, our wishes are...

67 G: dastetoon dard nakone.
S: Thank you.

A: Sue. Anyway, our wishes are...

68 M: pishrafto pas kardane darsa hastesh.
A: Progress and passing [courses] successfully, too.

69 G: zende bashin.
S: Long life to you.

70 M: bashe. Pas?
A: Okay. So?

71 G: kheyli mamnoon agha-ye doctor.
S: Thank you Mr. Dr.

72 M: badesh vase man email mikonid? Ya poroje ro…
A: Then will you email me? Or the project…

73 G: bale.
S: Yes.

74 M: ya on poroje ro khastrid...
A: Or you want the project…

75 G: harjoor shoma salah midoonid.
S: Whatever you suggest.

76 M: faghat behem begid, zekr konid ke ba man sohbat kardid ke yek hafte dirtar bedid.
A: Just remind me, mention it that you have talked to me to send it to me a week later.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78 M: ke man yadam bashe chon migam man kheyli hasas hastam. In yek moredam hala in dafe dige chiz...</td>
<td>A: just for reminding me because I said it’s very important to me. This case is exception this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 G: dast-e shoma dard nakone. Ejaze midin morakhas besham?</td>
<td>S: Thank you very much. Do you permit me to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 G: mersi agha-ye doctor.</td>
<td>S: Thanks Mr. Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 M: moafagh bashin.</td>
<td>A: Good luck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 M: Khudanghadar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 M: khodanegahdar.</td>
<td>A: Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>HH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).</td>
<td>( \text{گوینده: توق توق (گوینده در میاند).} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door).</td>
<td>( \text{محاطب: بفرمایید.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Mokhatab: befamaeid.</td>
<td>( \text{مخاطب: بفرمایید.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee: Come in please.</td>
<td>( \text{مخاطب: بفرمایید.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 G: salam ostad.</td>
<td>( \text{گ: سلام استاد.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Hello Professor.</td>
<td>( \text{س: سلام استاد.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 M: salam aleykum.</td>
<td>( \text{م: سلام علیکم.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Hello.</td>
<td>( \text{م: سلام علیکم.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: How are you? I wanted to talk about the project you’ve recently assigned. May I?</td>
<td>( \text{م: چطور هستید؟ میخواهم در مورد پروژه‌یی که اخیرا داده بودید صحبت کنم. می‌توانید؟} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A: Yes, please take a seat.

G: متشکرم مرسی. عذرخواهی میکنم استاد من میدونم که باید پروژه رو به موقع تحولی بدم و شما هم زودتر اعلام کرده بودید. اما حقيقة اینه که به خاطر یه سری مشکلات شخصی که داشتم و فشار کاری که رو به بوده این نمی‌رسیدم بمه درا تا آخر ترم توه وقت متضمر بدم. خواستم ازتون بخواهم اگه امکانش هست براتون یه مقداری تمدیدش بکنیم و چندروز دیرتر بهتون بدم.


S: Thank you. I apologise, Professor. I know I must turn in the project at the due time and you’ve noted earlier. But the thing is because of a few personal issues and the work pressure, I can’t turn it in by the end of the semester, by the deadline. I wanted to ask you if it would be possible for you to extend the time a bit so I can turn it in to you a few days later.

M: ببينين، به نظر من هرکسی مشکلات شخصی خودشو داره. ممن مشکلات شخصی خودمو دارم، شما هم دارین. منم آز اول ترم این پروژه رو داده بودم. شما هم وقت داشتین میتوینستین برنامه ریزی پره‌ی کردین. حالا هم الان خیلی دیر نشده میتوینین یه جوری برنامه ریزی کنید که تا آخر ترم تمومش کنید. ولی اینکه من شرابی عدالت رو بر اه مه داشته‌جوا قابل نشم و برا شما شما هم وقت زیادی قابل نشم بمه اونانی ندیه! این چیزی که...الان شمار از این در برید بیرون نفر بعدی میاد یه مشکل دارم. مشکلات شخصی دارن؛ مم خوشنایی‌های رو این دکترکنن که تا آخر ترم تموم کنید. و سعی کنید که اینیکه وقت به پایان برده بره و رو تموم کنید. به نظر من بهترین کار اینه چون اگه من قرار بشه به پایه‌ی دیگه جنبه‌ی دیگه یه وقت اضافه به شما بدیم این عدالت نیست و فردای یکی دیگه میاد با یه مشکل شخصی دیگه. میتوین دیگره مشکل شخصی برای شما هست. وله نیاز دارم به اینکه عدالت رو رعایت بشه.

08 M: bebinin, be nazare man har kasi moshkelat-e shakhsi-ye khodesho dare. Manam moshkelat-e khodamo daram, shoma ham darin. Manam az avval-e term in poroje ro dade bodam. Shoma ham vaght daashin mitoonestin barname rizi konid ta akhar-e term tamoomesh konid. Vali inke man sharayet-e edalat ro baray-e hame daneshjooha ghael nasham va bara shoma ye vaght-e ziyadi ghael besham, baray-e onay-e dige... In chizi ke...alan shoma az in dar berid biron nafare badi miyad mige manam moshkel daram. Hame moshkelat-e shakhsi daran; manam khodam moshkelat-e shakhsi-ye khodamo daram. Bekhater-e hamin, mitoonaam dar vaghe tanha chizi ke mitoonaam be shoma begam: in-e ke say konid to hamin zaman-e andaki ke darin behtar in estefade ro bokonid. Va say
A: Look, to me everyone has their personal problems. I do and you do, too. I did assign this project from the beginning of the course. You had time and could have managed it to get it finished by the end of semester. But I have to be fair with all students and can’t give you extension. This is…when you walk out, next student would come in and say I have a problem, too. All people have their personal problems; I have my own personal problems. All I can advise is that you should try to make the best use of your limited time and finish your project before the deadline. In my opinion, this is the best thing to do. Because if I want to give you a bonus actually an extra one, it’s not fair and tomorrow one would come with another personal problem. I know you have a personal problem, but I have to be fair.

S: You’re right. I totally understand and would have never made such a request in a normal situation, but I faced some problems that I had to make this request. Well, could you give me a piece of advice? I do my best to submit it at the due time but if I can’t make it for 1%, is there anything specific that I can do to make up my mark?

M: کار خاصی که… اگر به نظر من شما تمام تلاش‌تون رو بذارین منم حاضرم وقت بذارم اگه نیاز داشته‌ید بیام کمکتون کنم این با موضوع و سر تایم که برا همه هست تموم کنید و اگه نیاز به راهنمایی بیشتری داشته‌ین کمکتون کنم که به موق عکس کنید. و اگه نیاز به راهنمایی بیشتری داشته‌ین کمکتون کنم که به موق عکس کنید. ولی اینکه تایم زیاد کم از این بیکی واقعاً از دست برندم ولی اینکارو میتونه بگم که اگه کمکی از شخص خودم بهتون بچوین با منبعبه بخواین بپنهون معرفی کنم و تو این کار میتونه کمک کنم ولی نه بیشتر.

10 M: kar-e khasi ke... agar be nazare man shoma tamame talashetoon ro bezarin, manam hazeram vaght bezaram age niyaz dashtid biyam komaketoon konam ino be moghe va sar-e timesh ke bara hame hast tamoom konid. Va age niyaz be rahnamaeye be shiharti dashtin komaketoon konam ke be moghe tamoom konid, vali inke timo ziyad konam, az in yeki kari
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dastam bar nemiyad vali inkaro mitoonam bokonam ke age komaki az shakhse khodam bekhayn ya manabeei bekhayn beheton moarrefi konam va to in kar mitoonam komak konam vali na bishtar.</td>
<td>A: A specific thing… To me, if you put all your efforts into it, in case of need, I would help you to get it done at the due time, but if you want me to extend the time, I can’t do it for you. However, if you want my help, I can introduce a source(s) if you wish, but not more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Thanks so much for your advice. I do my hardest to submit it on time as you preferred.</td>
<td>S: Thanks so much for your advice. I do my hardest to submit it on time as you preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Surely you can do as you have a good plan.</td>
<td>A: Surely you can do as you have a good plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: Thank you.</td>
<td>S: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Most welcome.</td>
<td>A: Most welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 G</td>
<td><strong>ghorban-e shoma. Khodahafez.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>S:</strong> Sincerely yours. Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5 LL**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>01</strong></td>
<td>Gooyande: salam ostad.  &lt;br&gt; Speaker: Hello Professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>02</strong></td>
<td>Mokhatab: salam.  &lt;br&gt; Addressee: Hello.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>03</strong></td>
<td><strong>S:</strong> ‘FAMIL’ hastam. Daneshjoo-ye, in term bahaton ye vahedi dashtam.  &lt;br&gt; I am ‘FAMILY NAME’. I am a student. I have taken a course with you this semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>04</strong></td>
<td><strong>A:</strong> bale bale, bale.  &lt;br&gt; Yes, yes, yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **05** | **S:** valla gharaz az mozahemiat inke in term chon nim sal-e dovom hastesh, nim sal-e kootahi hastesh, man chand ta vahed-e dige ham daram ke hame asatid poroje dadan baray-e darso. Bad ba tavajoh be in zaman-e kootah vaghean maghdur nist ke betoonim. Inke nim sal-e dovom-e va hamintor ke khodetoon behtar midoonid kheyli nim sal-e kootahi hasto, term term-e shoolooghi hastesh man kheyli vahed gerefam haghkhatesh. Bad ye toori hastesh ke man term-e ghabl ham vazeiyat-e moaddelam khoob naboode. Kheyli in term daram say mikonam moaddelamo mikesham bala o inha. Mikhastam bebinam age emkan dashte bashe ye komaki konid ke masalan baray-e zaman-e poroje ba tavajoh be inke darsay-e dige asatid, hame poroje dadand kheyli tadakhol pish omade. Age betoonid ye rahkari ye chizi jolo pamoon bezarid ke ma betoonim in porojamoono era konid ke ma nomramoon taht-e tasir in amr gharar nagire, mamnoon misham.  
The reason that I disturbed you is that because we are in the second semester and this semester is shorter than the first one, and I have a few more courses for which all professors have assigned projects, so we are not able to do the project due to this short period of time. You know better that this semester is shorter than the other one and is a busy semester; I’ve actually taken many courses. My GPA’s status in the last semester wasn’t high and I am trying to improve it this time. I wondered if it would be possible to help me in a way for example, for the time of submitting the project. Because there have been other courses, it is all a bit of a |
### Role Play Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th><strong>mess. If you can sort it out that we can finish our project. And it [the delay, the faulty] does not affect our mark, I’d be thankful.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06 A:</td>
<td><strong>khahesh mikonam. Montaha, hamontor ke midooinid, man entezar daram ke shoma poroje ro be moghe tahvil bedin va fekr mikonam agar ke...</strong> yani man entekhabo mizaram be ohde-ye khodetooon: ya poroje ro be moghe vase man miyarin va dar gheyr-e in soorat nomre ro az dast midin. No problem. However, as you know, I expect you to submit your project at the due time, and I think if that...it means I’d leave you free to choose: either turn in the project at the due time or otherwise you will lose the mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 S:</td>
<td><strong>ostad...</strong> Professor...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 A:</td>
<td><strong>entekhab ba khodetoone-e.</strong> The choice is yours (it’s up to you).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 S:</td>
<td><strong>ostad bahs-e inke shoma ba tavajoh be mabhas-e theory ke matrah shode to kelaso inha. Ona ro tonestam anjam bedam vali bahs-e in poroje o ina migam ba tavajoh be in ke...hala migam in bahs ham gharar-e har fard ham be soorate enferadi in poroje haro erae kone inha, nemidoonam hala chetor mishe. Mmm shayad betoonam ye kar-e motavasseti ro jamo joor konam vali onjori ke mad-e nazaretoon bashe ghaedatan nemishe yani faghat serfe tahvil dadan bashe mishe ye chizo amade kard va tahvil dad. Vali age ye chiz-e ba keyfiyyat behayn ghaedatan ta on tarikhi ke moayan kardin emkan pazir nistesh.</strong> Professor, it’s about the theoretical perspective discussed in the class. I could cover those, but I would say given that...this discussion [the project] is supposed to be presented individually, I don’t know how it will go. Umm perhaps I can wrap up a medium-quality project but it would not be like the one you would like to see but it can be ready just [to meet the deadline] for submission. But if you would like a significantly improved work, it certainly wouldn’t be possible with this given deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 A:</td>
<td><strong>jenab-e ‘FAMIL’, hamontor ke goftam, man az lahaz-e zamani, zaman bestiar baram mohem hastesh va entekhab ro be ohde-ye khodetoon mizaram.</strong> Mr ‘FAMILY NAME’, as I said, in terms of timing, timing is very important to me and the choice is yours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11 S: | **yani bahs-e in-e ke faghat in nomre-ei ke baray-e poroje ekhtesas dade shode, serfan bar asas-e erae yek...** It means the point is that the project’s mark is merely based on presenting a...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A: na. Man yeki az faktor haei ke dar nazaretam, in hast ke daneshjoo betoone zamanbandi ro betoone ghashang modiriyat kone. Dar natije, fekr mikonam ke hala shoma barnamehatono bebinind chejooriye. No. One of the things that I’ve considered is that a student be able to manage the time. Therefore, I think that you’d better check how your schedule is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S: dorost-e. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A: montaha, az lahaz-e zamanbandi rooy-e man hesab nakonid. Man mitoonam komaketoon konam az lahaz-e mohtavaye projatoon. Montaha, az lahaz-e...zamanbandi bara man kheyli mohem hast ke shoma be moghe tahvil bedin. But you don’t count on me [don’t expect me] about timing. I can help you with the project itself but not the timing. It is very important to me that you submit it at the due time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S: pas ostad man sayamo mikonam ke nahayate talashamo bokonam ke tooy-e hamoon zaman beresoonam vali age faghat keyfiyyat-e kar paein bood, dige be har hal... So Professor, I try my hardest to prepare it over this period, but if the quality of the work was poor, anyway…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A: hatman agar komaki khastin rooy-e man hesab konid. Of course, if you need help, count on me [I am in].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S: say moikonam ke ba...harchand man dar moored-e in poroje ba afradi ke az, ba sal-e balahiya mashverat kardam. I try that with…however, I have talked about this project with other students in higher years [sophomore].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A: besiyar ali! Great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S: vali khob ghaedatan ona ham migostan ke shoma, ba tavajoh be inke in vahed ba ostad-e dige-ei ham moarrefi shode bod But, well, they did say that you, given that this course was taught with another professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A: dorost-e. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21    | S: mishod ba onam gereft. Vali ba tavajoh be tajarobe shoma va inha ma omadam az tajarobe-ye shoma estefade konam.  
It would have been possible to take it with him/her [the other professor]. But given that, I came (wanted) to use your experiences because you’re distinguished. |
| 22    | A: besiyar ali!  
Great! |
| 23    | S: doost dashtam ke in darso ba shoma pas konamo in. Be khater-e hamin mabhas omadam ke hala be har hal in entezaro daram ke be har hal betoonam in term ro ham ba ye nomre-ye khoob be payan beresonam.  
I would love to pass this course with you. Because of that I came here and expect to pass and finish this course successfully, anyway. |
Of course, you do. As I know, you’re so motivated and keen to do it as you wish. |
| 25    | S: ghorban-e shoma mersi.  
Thanks. |
| 26    | A: ghorban-e shoma.  
Thank you. |
| 27    | S: ishalla bad az inke omadam erae konam, ba ham ye sohbati mikkonim.  
After my presentation, I will talk to you for sure. |
| 28    | A: hatman, hatman.  
Sure. |
| 29    | S: ghoran-e shoma.  
Thank you. |
Thanks. Goodbye. |
| 6     | 01 Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).  
Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door). |
|       | 02 Mokhatab: janam befarmaeid.  
Addrssee: Please come in. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 03    | S: salam ostad.  
Hello professor. |
| 04    | A: salam azizam befarmaeid.  
Hello dear. Come in please. |
| 05    | S: bebakhshid shoma banda ro be ja miyarid?  
Man ba shoma ye dars daram, dars-e ‘tamrin darmani-ye 2’ ro daram baton tooy-e daneshkade. Eee  
Excuse me, do you remember me? I have a course with you which is ‘COURSE NAME’ in the department. Err  
| 06    | A: ‘tamrin darmani-ye 2’... khob oon class kheyli shooloogh-e. Hala man ghiyafatoon ye khorde baram ashnast vali...  
‘COURSE NAME’...well that class is overcrowded. Your face is quite familiar to me but... |
| 07    | S: akheee ma ghademoon boland-e, hamishe mirim tah-e class mishnim.  
Oonja sedaro behtar mishnavim oonjoori va jelo baghiya ro nemigirim vali bebakhshid ostad shoma yek {mokhatab mipare vasat}  
As we are tall, we always sit at the back of class where we can hear you better, and also do not block other students’ vision. But excuse me Professor, you {interrupted by the addressee} |
| 08    | A: pas az on trip-e sheytoon-e tahe classi.  
So you are one of the naughty boys at the back of class. |
| 09    | S: na na– hala hala bebakhshida vali ma ye, shoma ye poroje dade bodid gofte bodin ono anjam bedino ina bad ye moshkeli baramon pish omade natonestim agha kholase tamoomesh bekonim va ta akhar-e hafte bayad tahvil bedim.  
Vaghean age inkaro nakonin kheyli ham...akhe shoma 8 nomre gozashtin vase on poroje age chiz nashin, man momken-e biyoftam. Term-e akharam hastimo khob dige kholase momken-e yekam dard-e sar peyda konim. Age mishe agha-ye Doctor, kholase ye marhamati konin. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No No. Sorry but you assigned a project to work on, but I’ve got a problem that I couldn’t finish it. To cut it short, I have to turn it in to you by the end of this week. Definitely I can’t complete it by that date. Unfortunately, I was sick for a week and was then unwell for 7-8-10 days. Briefly, I couldn’t work on it. If you give me one more week, it means the deadline could be next week for me, I promise that I complete it and turn it in to you. If you wouldn’t do it…you’ve assigned 8 marks for it. If the extension doesn’t happen, I’ll probably fail this course. I am in my third year and it may cause a problem. If possible, Mr Dr please do (very hierarchical term) this favour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 A: <em>shoma daneshjooha-ye on tah-e kelas mesl-e tigh-e 2 labe darin: sar-e kelas sheytoon, akhar-e term az oon sheytoontar. Ma hamishe entezar darim daneshjoohaei ke on akhar-e kelas mishinan, hadeaghghal to poroje hashonam ye khorde sheytanat-e bishtari be kar bebaran hadeaghghal 2ta chiz nesbat be oon darsakhona behtar began.</em> You students at the back of class are like double-edged blade: you’re naughty in the class, naughtier at the end of the semester. We always expect students those who sit at the back of the class use their sense of humour more in their project at least, to say more compared to other hardworking students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 S: <em>akhe ostad bebinid akhe hamine</em> Professor, look, that’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A: <em>alanam</em> Now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 S: <em>be khoda agar ye chiz-e alaki mikhastam benevisam, sambalesh mikardam ta akhar-e hafie, vali akhe ye barname ye poroje-ye kheyli khoob gereftam; ye chiz-e kheyli khoob peyda kardam arzeshesho dare vaght bezaram. Hala sabet mikonam man behetoon ostad ke in chiz-e khoobi-ye. Hala shoma ye lotfi bokonin.</em> By God, if I wanted to give you a mediocre work, I could have done it by the end of the week. But I have a plan to make it impressive and find a very interesting topic which is worthy to work on. Well, I’ll prove it to you Professor that it’s superb. Well, kindly do a favour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 A: *shomaha chand rooz dige ham ke mirid sarbazi, shoma ham ke daneshgaham ghabool nemishin, ya daneshgaham ke gabool shodin, omadin dige haminjoori ba nomre-ye 10 ya 11 pass mikonin. Sar-e karam ke mirin har kari behetoon bedan...to sarbazi ke alhamdollehah hamatoon ya madarbozorgatoon fot mikone ye 7/8 bar, ya baba hatoon 6/7 bar aroosi mikone. Hamishe, mesle alan bahoone darin base farar kardan. Man to kolle [gooyande mipare vasat]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some time later, you all go to the military service, you don’t also get accepted in universities, or if you get accepted, you pass with low marks (11 or 12 out of 20). When you go to work, do any jobs given to you, always you have excuses luckily to escape like your grandmoms passed away 7-8 times or your dads get married 6-7 times. I {interrupted by the speaker}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15    | S: ostad nafarmaein  
Professor, please don’t label [on me] |
| 16    | A: [man to kolle] termam 2 bar az shoma nadidam ye soal-e darsi az man beparsin, joz in ke...  
I didn’t see you to ask me any questions about the topics/lessons taught [during the semester] except that… |
Please don’t say like that. So far, my overall GPA has been above 17.5 out of 20. Don’t say these things. Professor, I am not like that [you were describing]. You took me wrong with other students, but I promise, well, finally, one is not always supposed to… |
| 18    | A: bebin azizam bad taraf mire ba mashin mizane pay-e yekio mishkane bad mige bebakshid chon bebakshid ye kar-e majjani hast shoma alan ghol midin khob? Vali man aslan nemitoonam hich tazmini {Gooyande mipare vasat}  
Look dear, for example, a driver hits someone in a car crash, then he says “excuse me” because saying this is free. You make a promise right? But I can’t never [accept] a guarantee {interrupted by the speaker} |
| 19    | S: khob tazminesh in ke...  
Well, the guarantee is that… |
| 20    | A: [hich tazmini] vojod nadare. Shoma alan 3 mah vaght dashtin vase in poroje.  
There is no guarantee. You had 3 months for this project. |
| 21    | S: khob tazminesh inke agar man natoonestam inkaro anjam bedam, behem nomramo nemidin dige kollan.  
Well, the guarantee is that if I can’t make a good work, you don’t give the mark at all. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22 | A: vali khob shoma man alan  
   But well, you I now |
| 23 | S: dige che tazmini behtar az in.  
   What’s the better guarantee than this? |
| 24 | A: man daram ye bayad be shoma ye shans bedam ke baghiye nadaran. Va in kamlena aslan ye chiz-e eee monsefanei nist aslan ke man be shoma ye shansi bedam ke baghiye nadadam. Agar bekham inkaro bokonam bayad bara baghiye ham anjam bedam.  
   I am giving you a chance that others won’t have. And this is totally err unfair at all to give you a chance that are not given to other students. If I want to do it, I must do [am obliged to do] the same for others. |
| 25 | S: khob babat-e  
   Well, about |
| 26 | A: Shoma 3 mah. Aslan bara eee man namafhoome ke shoma 3 mah vaght dashtin, hala inkaro bezarin  
   You [had] 3 months. It doesn’t make sense err to me at all that you had 3 months [to work on the project], now you |
| 27 | S: pas  
   Then |
| 28 | A: vase hafte akhar anjam bedin ke hafte akharam, hala har moshkeli pish omad.  
   Alanam aslan nemitoonam tasavor konam ke shoma masalan ta hafte dige hatman inkaro anjam midin chon man bayad ghavanino methodhaye darsi khodamo zire pa bezaram be shoma vaghti bedam ke baghiye nadran.  
   Postpone the work until now which is the last week, any problems might happen. It is impossible for me to imagine that you can finish the work by the end of next week because I have to break my rules to give you more time that others won’t have. |
   Alright Professor. Okay if it is like that, I will do my hardest to turn in the project by the end of this week, of course, my project would be poor/low quality. But okay, as you prefer. |
30 A: vali khob man alan chon be pas-e hamin ke in shojaato dashtin khodetoon ba pay-e khodetoon sohbat konin, mitoonam beheton 4 rooz bishtar vaght bedam. However, well, because you are brave to come to my office and ask for the extension, I can give you 4-day extension.

31 S: bashe {labkhand} 4 roozam kheyli khoob-e, 4 roozam khoob-e. Dige fooghesh adam shab nemikhabe 4 rooz-e dige. Harjoori ast miresoonamesh. Okay {smile} 4 days is very good. Maximum I wouldn’t sleep 4 days [I work day and night]. It’s only 4 days. I do my hardest to turn it in.

32 A: na bara man, man donbale in nistam shoma berin bara man 40-50-60 safe benivisin. Shoma shayad 3 safhe benevisin baray-e man vali keyfiyyate kar az kamiyyat kar bara man mohemtare. No, for me, I am not looking for a project including 40-50-60 pages. You maybe write 3 pages for me, but its quality is more important than its quantity.

33 S: bale
Yes

34 A: shoma 3 bara man safhe benevisin vali 2 ta idea-e khoob, 1 idea-e khoob toosh bashe, behtar az inke bekhayn bara man bedin 50 safhe 70 safhe mesle baghiye baram benevisin. You write 3 pages for me but [your project] includes two good ideas or it discusses one good idea, it is much better than writing a 50- or 70-page project like other students.

35 S: hamine. Ma ye mozo kheyli khoob peyda kardim, delemoon mikhad hatman inkaro anjam bedim. Bashe. That’s it. I found a good topic, I would like to work on it. Okay.

36 A: be omid khoda.
Hope in God.

37 S: kheyli mamnoon.
Thank you very much.

38 A: khahesh mikonam.
Most welcome.

39 S: hatman. Ehtiyaj ast man esmamo beheton bedam? Sure. Do you want me to give you my name?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A: <em>na hamin</em> ke ghiyafatono mibinam kafi-ye <em>labkhand</em>&lt;br&gt;No. It’s enough to show your face up <em>{smile}</em>&lt;br&gt;41 S: <em>{labkhand}</em> mamnoon. <em>Khodahafez.</em>&lt;br&gt;Thank you. Goodbye.&lt;br&gt;42 A: <em>khodahafez.</em>&lt;br&gt;Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7     | **HH**<br>01 *Gooyande: salam ostad.*<br>S: Hello Professor.<br>02 *Mokhatab: salam.*<br>A: Hello.<br>03 S: *haletoon khoob-e?*<br>How are you?<br>04 A: *mersi, shoma khoobi?*<br>Thanks, how are you?<br>05 S: *bebakhshid mozahem shodam.*<br>Sorry I disturbed you.<br>06 A: *na khahesh mikonam befarmaeid.*<br>No problem. Come in please.<br>07 S: *salamatin? Hamoontor ke vaght gerefte boodam, mikhistam ye mozooei ro matrah konam bahatooon.*<br>As I already made an appointment with you, I wanted to talk about an issue.<br>08 A: *shoma bebakhshid esmetoon?*<br>Excuse me, you, your name?<br>09 S: *man ‘ESM’ hastam.*<br>I am ‘FIRST NAME’.<br>10 A: *ahan. Khob khob*<br>Alright. Well
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11    | S: daneshjoo-ye vahed-e ‘tarrahi mekanik 2’ (ESM-e VAHED-e DARSI).  
I am the student of your class ‘Mechanical Design 2’ (COURSE’s NAME). |
| 12    | A: khob khob na yadam omad.  
I just remembered you. |
| 13    | S: poroje-ei hastesh gharar bood {mokhatab mipare vasat}  
There is a project which was supposed to {interrupted by the addressee} |
| 14    | A: gharar bood tahvil bedin?  
You’re supposed to submit it? |
| 15    | S: tahvil bedim.  
Submit it. |
| 16    | A: khob?  
So? |
| 17    | S: ta 2 mah dige hast mohlatesh.  
The deadline is for the next 2 months. |
| 18    | A: khob?  
So? |
| 19    | S: midoonam kheyli bayad be moghe boodo ino vali ye kam karay-e pare vaght ham hastesh. Bara hamin, kholase ye kami moraddad hastam..., nemidoonam...  
I know I must be on time but I have a part-time job. For that reason, I am doubtful, I don’t know… |
| 20    | A: yani mikhay alan tamdidesh koni ghaziyaro?  
It means do you want to extend the time now? |
| 21    | S: tahvil ke dade mishe ghatan.  
For sure, I will turn it in. |
| 22    | A: khob?  
So? |
| 23    | S: Vali shayad ye baze-ye zamanı bsihtari ro betalaba.  
But it might need a longer period of time. 10 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24 A: cheghadr?  
   How much? | |
| 25 S: 10 rooz.  
   10 days. | |
| 26 A: ahan.  
   Right. | |
| 27 S: masalan 15 rooz. Nahayatan ta 2 hafte fekr konam tamdid beshe. Moshkeli pish miyad age...?  
   For example, 15 days. At least 2 weeks if I think it can be extended. Would it be a problem if...? | |
| 28 A: khob, alan 2 mah vaght darin dige, dorost-e?  
   Well, you have 2 months, right [don’t you]? | |
| 29 S: bale, bale ta 2 mah dige.  
   Yes, yes. Until the next two months. | |
| 30 A: yani 2 mah vaght darin.  
   It means you have two months to go. | |
| 31 S: man daram tamame talashamo mikonam.  
   I am doing my best. | |
| 32 A: khob hamoon. Man mikham begam ke alan bezar pish beri yani pish boro haminjor edame bedeh.  
   Exactly. I want to say that let it go and keep going like that. | |
| 33 S: dorost-e.  
   Right. | |
| 34 A: agar ke nazdik-e 2 mah shod tamoom nakardi, oon moghe be in fekr kon ke masalan shayad 10 rooz. Yani mikham begam ke az alan nakhah ke 10 rooz-e ezafe fekr koni.  
   If the deadline was so close and you didn’t finish, then think about perhaps 10 days. I meant that don’t think about 10 days extension from now. | |
<p>| 35 S: dorost-e. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A: <em>are. Man mitoonam behet oon 10 roozo behet bedam vali khob nemikham az alan behet begam ke oon 10 rooz ro dari. Khob?</em>&lt;br&gt;Yes. I can give you 10 days more, but I don’t want to tell you that you have that 10 days from now. Okay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>S: <em>bale</em>&lt;br&gt;Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A: <em>pish boro</em>&lt;br&gt;Keep going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S: <em>dorost-e</em>&lt;br&gt;Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A: <em>vaghti ke vaghean didi ke jam nemishe, oonja hala baz baham sohbat mikonim.</em>&lt;br&gt;Once you see that you can’t turn it in, we can talk about it together again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S: <em>eee khedmateton, man migam kheyli, kheyli man hamishe say kardam be moghe basham.</em>&lt;br&gt;Err I would say, I am always on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>A: <em>oohoom</em>&lt;br&gt;Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>S: <em>vali yekam in kar-e pare vaght ke man daram daneshgah</em>&lt;br&gt;But my part-time job for which I work at the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>A: <em>na, motavaje-am. Motevaje-am. Be har hal hame gereftari daran.</em>&lt;br&gt;No, I know. I know. Everyone has their personal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>S: <em>kheyli kholase bebachshid.</em>&lt;br&gt;Excuse me, anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>A: <em>na ghabele darke vali khob.</em>&lt;br&gt;No, I understand it though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>S: <em>midoonam ke to kar-e shoma ham hamechi bayad be moghe bashe.</em>&lt;br&gt;I know that for you, turning in the project must be at the due date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 48    | A: *are chon be har hal daneshjooha age nayaran va bekhan invar oonvar konan baram sakht-e dige.*  
      | Yes, if students do not turn in their project [at the due date] and want to turn it in with delay, then it makes my job difficult. |
| 49    | S: *midoonam shoma ham*  
      | I know you also |
| 50    | A: *chon be har hal shoma ham yek bakhash az kara-ei ke*  
      | Because you also [have] a part of works |
| 51    | S: *daneshjooha-ye dige ham hastan. Khodetoonam (saretoon) shoolooge bayad review beshe in ghaziyo kholase.*  
      | There are also other students and you are busy. You have to review the works. |
| 52    | A: *are*  
      | Yes |
| 53    | S: *goftam zoodtar begam. Pas kheyli mamnoonam.*  
      | Wanted to discuss this with you earlier. Well thank you very much. |
| 54    | A: *mersi ke hala mano dar jariyan gozashtid vali khob*  
      | Thanks for discussing this with me, but well |
| 55    | S: *bozorgavarid.*  
      | You’re honourable. |
| 56    | A: *are, felan hamonjor edame bede. Agar oon lahze akhar ehsas kardi vaghean naresidi jam koni, biya ba ham ye sohbat konim.*  
      | For now, keep going [like this]. In the last moments, if you feel that you need more time, come [to see me] to talk about it together. |
| 57    | S: *salamat bashin, mamnoon. Kheyli mamnoon bebakhsid.*  
      | Thank you very much. Apologies. |
| 58    | A: *na khaheh mikonam.*  
      | No, most welcome. |
| 59    | S: *mersi az vaghtetoon. Khodahafez.*  
      | Thank you for your time. Goodbye. |
### Role Play Conversations

| Pairs | 60 | A: khodahafez.  
Goodbye. |
|-------|----|---|
| 8 LH  | 01 | Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).  
Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door). |
|       | 02 | Mokhatab: befarmaeid.  
Addressee: Come on in. |
|       | 03 | S: salam.  
Hello. |
|       | 04 | A: salam alaykum.  
Hello. |
|       | 05 | S: hal-e shoma khoob-e?  
How are you? |
|       | 06 | A: ghorban-e shoma.  
[I’m good] Thank you. |
|       | 07 | S: khoob hastin?  
Are you fine? |
|       | 08 | A: mersi.  
Thanks. |
I apologise. I err had an appointment but I know that I took your time. Maybe you are very busy. |
No worries. Go ahead. |
I wanted to seek advice from you about an issue. Ah how to say err this course is generally a bit difficult for me [to understand]. |
<p>|       | 12 | A: shoma koooom dars ro ba man darin? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S: man dars-e ‘X’ (ESM-e VAHED-e DARSI) ba shoma daram. Vali midoonam ke chon ye meghdari az lahaz-e teoretikal khodesh ye meghdari sakht-e, az lahaz-e mafhoomi bayad roosh kar bokonam. Bara hamin poroje ro nemitoonam behetoon tahvil bedam. Mitoonam tahvil bedam onjoori ke delam mikhado bayad bashe, nemitoonam behetoon tahvil bedam. I have ‘X’ [COURSE NAME] with you. But I know because this is a bit hard in terms of theory, I have to work on it more to make it conceptualised. For that reason, I can’t submit the project to you. I can submit it but it’s not like what I’d like to be and it should be, then I can’t submit it to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A: harjoori ke hast tahvil bedin ta akhar-e vaght. Whatever it is, submit it by the deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S: faghat mikhastam ino motmaen besham. Biam inja azatoon beporsam chon midoonam ke rooy-e nomre-ye payan termam kheyli tasir mizare vali {maks} I just wanted to make sure about it. I came to ask you about it because I know that this project’s mark would affect my final mark {pause}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A: man nemitoonam kari dar in zamine bokonam. Shoma dalil-ee movajahi darid bara takhretoon? I can’t be of more help to you in this regard. Do you have a convincing reason for your delay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S: eee na dalil movajahi ke nemishe goft dashte basham. Vali ye meghdar bekhater-e in ke Err, no. I don’t have a convincing reason, but it was a bit because of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A: bekhater-e in ke? Because of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S: na faghat be khater-e in masale ke… No. Only because of these problems that…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A: ta harjaeisho ke neveshtin tavil bedin chon sharayet baray-e hame bayad mosavi bashe dige. Submit what you have completed so far because the conditions must be equal for everyone then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S: bale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22 A: nemitoonam ke. Age gharar bashe be shoma vaght bedam, bayad be hame vaght bedam.  
I can’t [do it] then. If I am supposed to extend the time for you, I have to extend it for everyone. |
| 23 S: bale  
Yes | |
| 24 A: be har hal age dars vase shoma sangin-e, bara hame sangin-e.  
Anyway, if the course is hard for you, it is hard for all, too. |
Would it be ever possible to extend the time a bit for everyone or not? Because I think this is the problem that most of the students have. |
| 26 A: valla shoma avvalin nafari hastin ke omadin inja.  
Actually, you are the first person that come here. |
| 27 S: khob shayad man avvalin nafari bodam ke be khodam ejaze damad ke biyam sohbat konam. Baghiye shayad rooshoon nashe hala.  
Well, maybe I am the first person that is brave to come [here] to talk about it. Others may feel shy [to come]. |
| 28 A: aaaa  
Aaaa |
| 29 S: hala inam age beshet, mishe fekr mikonam.  
If this would be possible, it’s possible I think. |
| 30 A: be har hal emrooz rooz-e akhar-e o kheyli ham dir-e baray-e inke in tasmino begirim. Baghiye ham haminghadr vaght dashtan, kesi dige-ei ham ta hala chizi nagofte, in-e ke moteassemfam.  
Anyway, today is the last day and it’s also very late to make this decision. The other students have also had the same time; no one else hasn’t yet complained anything, for that I am sorry. |
<p>| 31 S: kheyli khob. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alright.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 A: man behtar in pishnahadi ke mitoonam behetoon bokonam in-e ke {maks} porojatoono ta har jaei ke alan ast, tahvil bedin. Ta har jaei ke tahvil dade bashin nomrasho migirin. Az in be bad ham inshalla baghiyasho jobran mikonid too-e akhar-e term. The best suggestion I can give to you is {pause}: turn in your draft in the current form. With this submission, you would get your score for what you have done. From now on, I hope you can improve it in the final exam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 S: kheyli mamnoon az vaghti ke dadin. I thank you for your time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 A: ghorboneton beram. Sincerely yours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 A: movaffagha bashin. Good luck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 S: Khodahafez-e shoma. Goodbye.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 A: Khodahafez. Goodbye.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| LL | 01 Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad). Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door). |
|    | 02 Mokhatab: befarmaein. Addressee: Come in please. |
| 03 | S: salam ostad. Hello Professor. |
| 04 | A: salam aleykum. Hello. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 05    | S: *hal-e shoma khoob-e?*  
      | How are you?            |
| 06    | A: *mamnoonam.*  
      | [I’m good.] Thank you.  |
| 07    | S: *chand daghighe vaght darin agha-ye doctor?*  
      | Do you have time for a few minutes Mr Dr? |
| 08    | A: *mmm Befarmaein. Vaght gerefte boodin az ghabl?*  
      | Umm welcome. Did you make an appointment already? |
| 09    | S: *mmm na vali haghigehatsh ye mozoo-e mohemi-ye ke mikhastam chand daghighe vaghtetono begiram. Aaa*  
      | Umm no but actually, it’s an important issue that I wanted to take your time for a few minutes. Aaa |
| 10    | A: *dar mored-e chi-ye shoma?*  
      | What’s about?           |
| 11    | S: *ostad*  
      | Professor              |
| 12    | A: *daneshjoo-ye man hastin shoma?*  
      | Are you my student?    |
| 13    | S: *bale bale, man daneshjoo hastin. In dars-e tahvil-e poroje ke ba shoma daram.*  
      | Yes, yes. I am [your] student and have a course with you for which I have to submit a project. |
| 14    | A: *oohoom*  
      | Aha                    |
| 15    | S: *haghigehatsh ostad, man biroon kar mikonam, ye khorde moshkel daram va eee fekr mikonam natoonam in poroje ro ta akhar-e term tahvil bedam. Mikhastam azaton ye khaheshi konam agar emkan dare...*  
      | The truth is that professor, I work, I also have a little problem and err I think I can’t finish the project by the end of semester. I wanted to request you if it would be possible...  

### Role Play Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A: valla shoma avayel-e termam ke be har hal biroon kar mikardino daneshjoo boodin dige. Yani be har hal midoonestin dige. Ma avael-e kelas miyaym avayel-e jalase, avval-e avval migim: agha in tarikh-e tahvil-e poroje hasto. Nemidoonam be har hal. Nemidoonam ehtemalan nomrasho nemigirin dige. Indeed, from the beginning of semester, you go to work and are a student, too. I mean anyway, you knew that you are a student. We told students from the beginning, in the first session of the classes: this is the deadline for the project. I don’t know anyway. I don’t know, probably you don’t get the mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S: ostad haghighatesh kheyli bara ma, moshkel peyda mikonim chon bayad shahriye ro bedim, karam mikonam. Age emkan dare, shoma ye tajdid-e nazari befarmaein. Mmm The truth is [that] professor, for us it’s very…we would face a problem because we would have to pay an [extra] tuition fee, I also work. If it would be possible, you take [it] into consideration again. Umm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S: yek zaman-e bishtari. A bit more time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A: mitoonin hazf bokonin in darso. You can drop this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S: dorost-e ostad. Term-e bad ham dobare hamin dastan-e ostad. Be har hal majbooram pare vaght kar konam. Mmm in porojam kheyli sangin-e. Man vahedhaye-ghablim ro {mokhatab parid vasat} That’s right, Professor. I’d be in the same situation in the next semester. I have to work part-time. Umm this project is very dense. My last courses are {interrupted by the addressee}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A: mitoonin poroje ro sar-e hamoon moghe hala ye zarre naghes tar tahvil bedin ya mmm chon be har hal, la-aghal oontoori ye nomre-ei migirin. Vali bad-e vaght biyarin, dige man fekr nemikonam chon man aslan vaght nemikonam tashih bokonam. Dige man hamoon rozoo gozashtamo nomrehasham fardash mikham rad bokonam bere dige, magar inke hala nesf-e biyarin tahvil bedino. Manam nomre-ei hala bar asas-e oonche tahvil dadin behetoon bedam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pairs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Role Play Conversations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can submit your project with partial results at the due time or umm because anyway, at least you can get a mark for that part. But if you turn in it after the deadline, I don’t think so as I have no time to mark it. I assigned that day and will finalise the marks in the next day unless you turn in what you have done partially. I’ll give you the mark based on what you’ve submitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23 S: *pas mishim ostad?*  
Would I pass it, Professor? |
| 24 A: *valla dige oon dige...*  
Well, that is, that is… |
| 25 S: *{labkhand}*  
*{Smile}* |
| 26 A: *monde be in ke, hala emtahan-e payan term chetori bashe o baghiye kara o.*  
*Man ke shomaro ta hala sar-e kelas ke nadidam. Hala be har hal mesle inke kelas ham ke nemiayn.*  
It depends on how you take your final exam and the result of your other [class] activities. I haven’t often seen you in the classes. It seems you don’t come to the classes. |
| 27 S: *na injooori ham nist ke nayaym ostad. Bazi jalasat ro boodim vali dige bazihasho majboor boodim ke bargardim sherkat kar ziyad boodo ina.*  
No, it’s not like that I don’t participate the classes. I attended some classes but I have had to miss some of the other classes to go back to work. |
| 28 A: *be har hal, bashe. hala shoma biarin bedino ma ham bebinim ke chikar chikar mitonim.*  
Anyway, okay. Turn it in and then let’s see what what we can do [for it]. |
| 29 S: *dast-e shoma dard nakone.*  
Appreciate it. |
| 30 A: *kharesh mikonam.*  
No problem. |
| 31 S: *kheyli mamnoon.*  
Thank you very much. |
<p>| 32 A: <em>moafagh bashin.</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good luck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S: <em>ba ejazatoon.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With your permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A: <em>khodahafez.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S: <em>khodanegahdar.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 10    | <strong>LL</strong> |
|       | 01 <em>Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).</em>  |
|       | Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door). |
|       | 02 <em>Mokhatab: befarmaeid.</em>  |
|       | Addressee: Come in please. |
|       | 03 S: <em>ostad ejaze ast biam too?</em>  |
|       | Professor, may I come in? |
|       | 04 A: <em>befarmaein befarmaein. Khoob hastin?</em>  |
|       | Come in please. Welcome. How are you? |
|       | 05 S: <em>ghorban-e shoma ostad, man {mokhatab mipare vasat}</em>  |
|       | [I am good.] Thank you Professor. I {interrupted by the addressee} |
|       | 06 A: <em>shoma?</em>  |
|       | You? |
|       | 07 S: ‘<em>ESM’. Ee kelas-e</em>  |
|       | I’m ‘FIRST NAME’. Err class |
|       | 08 A: <em>hamahang karde boodin? ke dar vaghe alan vaght gerefte boodin.</em>  |
|       | Did you make an appointment already? Actually, you made this appointment. |
|       | 09 S: <em>na valla hamahang nakarde boodam bahatoon.</em>  |
|       | No. The thing is that I hadn’t made an appointment. |
|       | 10 A: <em>ee</em>  |
|       | Err |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S: vali mikhastam ke…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But I wanted that…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A: khob pas befarmaeid ke chon bachehay-e dige-ei ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well, so go ahead because there are other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S: are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because 1 or 2 other students will come. They made an appointment. [Then] I can make them all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S: ee rastesh mozahem shodam began ke, valla ostad {maks} man aslan dars-e shoma ro entekhab kardam chon midoonestam, tarif-e shoma ro shenide boodam hala be har tarighi vali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Err actually, I disturbed you to talk to you that, Professor {pause} I took this course with you because I knew, I heard a lot about you in different ways but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A: kharesh mikonam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S: motasefane be ye elali nemitoonam porojatoono tahvil bedam va bara manam kheyli mohemm-e in nomre payan termo moaddelo dastano in harfa. Hala mikhastam began ke {mokhatab mipare vasat}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfortunately, due to some reason, I can’t turn the project in [but] the final exam’s mark and my GPA are important to me. I just wanted to say {interrupted by the addressee}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A: che dalili? Dalilesh chi-ye?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What’s the reason? What’s that reason?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S: valla ye meghdar moshkelat-e hala kheyli ham saih nist began vali moshkelat-e khanevadegi nashod. Bahane nemiyaram ostad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actually, there were some private family issues which it’s not appropriate to talk about them here. I don’t want to make an excuse, professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A: khob?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 S: hala vali kollan darsam zaeif, darsam bad nist. Err kheyli hala moaddelam ina bad nist. Kheyli nemikham moaddelam biyad paein. Age mishe, ye zarre zaman bishtar. Generally, I am not amateur at this course. My GPA is okay, too. I don’t want my GPA to get low. If it’d be possible, a bit more time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 A: khob, akhe che moshkeli boode shoma natoonestid porojatoono anjam bedin? Be har hal zamani ke dadim bara poroje kafi boode. Hanoozam forsat darin mitoonin az doostanetoonam komak begirin. Well, what’s been the problem that you couldn’t do your project? There was enough time for doing it. You still have time and can get help from your friends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 S: harf-e shoma matin va sahih. hagh ba shomast. Vali ddd faghat mikham ke be man ye zarre zaman bedin age mishe lotfan? You’re right. But err I just want you to give me a bit more time if possible, please?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 H: khob injori akhe kheyli az doostan-e dige-ei ham ke hastan, belakhare moshkel daran, kar daran, dargirihay-e khodeshoono daran. Hame belakhare momken-e ke dar Well, there are other friends who have problems, have stuff to do and are busy with many things. Everyone has their own problem, anyway that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 S: eee Err</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 H: hagh-e ona ejhaf beshe chon zamani ke dade shode bara hame yeksan boode, sharayet bara hame yeksan boode. Man khodam dark miknam to doran daneshjooei khodam pish omade. Belakhare moshkelat-e boode, vali khob nomramam kam shode. Amma khob belakhare eee shoma, agar man bedoonam sharayetet chetoriye, shayad betoonam ye komaki behet bokonam. Begam ba doostani kar bokoni ke hala dar vaghe komaki behet bokonam ye sharayet-e injoori vali nemitoonam dar vaghe zamano bara shoma avaz bokonam. would ignore their right as the time was same for all and the condition was same for all, too. I understand you and the same happened to me when I was a university student. There were problems and I got low scores then. But err if I knew your situation, I might be able to help you. [I would] suggest you to work with other students. But I can’t change (extend) the time for you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professor, what you’re saying is right. There is a deadline and I have to finish the project.

   You’re saying deadline. It means it’s over.

29 S: hagh ba shomast. Vali mikhashtam begam ye zarre be man zaman bedin. Man ghol midam ke porojam kheyli poroje khobi az to ab dar miyad.
   You’re right. But I wanted to say to give me a bit more time. I promise to make a significantly improved project.

30 H: eee, bebin agar
   Err, look if

31 S: ye meghdari
   A bit

32 H: yek meghdari be shoma zaman bedam be digaran zaman nadam, in onvaght dar hagh-e oona zolm mishe.
   Giving you a bit more time, and not giving it to the other students would ignore their right.

33 S: dorost-e ostad vali baghiye moshkel-e mano nashtan ke. Man
   Right but Professor, the other students did not have my problem. I

34 H: shoma nemidooni. Man nemidoonam.
   You don’t know. I don’t know.

35 S: age dashtan ya hala har mozooei bood, ehtemalan miomadan matrah mikardan. Ehtemalan mitoonestan jamo joresh konand.
   If they had any, they would probably have come to talk about it. Likely they could sort it out.

36 H: shayad inghadr dargiran natoonestan biyan. Shayad inghadr moshkel daran ke vaght-e ino nakardan. Shoma moshkelet be che tartibe?
   They might be pretty busy that they couldn’t find time. What’s your problem?

37 S: valla ye moshkel-e khonevadegi. Man kheyli nemitoonam, midoonin kheyli nemishe bazesh kard.
### Role Play Conversations

Actually, it’s a kind of family issue. I can’t very, you know, I can’t talk about it very much.

38 A: *khob ishalla ke dorost mishe. Man faghat mitoonam be shoma ye komaki bokonam ke dar vaghe agar ke eshkali dari tooy-e marahel-e anjam-e porojat, moshkeli dari. Be shoma masalan betor-e khas javab bedam eshkalateto va yeki az dota doostatai ham ke motmaenam ke kareshoon jelotar rafte ro masalan bahashoon sohbat bokonam azashoon bekham ke ba shoma ye hamkari bokonan ye komaki be shoma bekonan ke karet saritar pish bere.*

Well, I hope that will be alright. I can help you only in the discussion you’re writing up to get there if you have any problem. For example, giving feedback on your current draft or answering your questions specifically. I can also talk to your classmates who are almost done with their work to assist you to make good progress.

39 S: *ostad*
   Professor

40 A: *in fekr konam tasiresh kheyli bishtar az zaman ezafe ast. Dar morede zamane ezafe vaghean nemitoonam aslan hich kari bokonam.*

   I think this is more helpful than getting an extension. Regarding the extension, I can’t help you with it.

41 S: *eee*
   Err

42 A: *chon in ghanooni ast ke gozashtim. Agar ye bar ke naghz beshe dige dafe haye badi har term haminintro mishe. Man khahesh mikonam ke dige bishtar az in esrar nakon!*

   Because this is the rule that is on. If it’s broken, the next semester will be like this. I do request you not to insist on it anymore!

43 S: *man faghat ye chiz-e koochik begam.*

   I would just say only a little thing.

44 A: *manam khodam to mazoor-e akhlaghi gharar migiram.*

   I would be in an unethical/unpleasant situation.

45 S: *man faghat ye chiz-e koochik begam ostad. kamelan harf-e shoma sahih vali man ghol midam poroje-am poroje kheyli khobi beshe. Yani man ino be shoma*
ghol midam agar yek mohebbat-e koochki dar hagham bokonid, man porojei tahlil midam ke dar hadde kheyli aadi.
I would just say a little thing, Professor. You’re completely right but I do promise that my project turns into an impressive one. [It] Means I will make this promise to you if you give me a short extension for my sake, I’ll submit a high quality one.

46 A: age porojat ye khorde paeintar ham mishe, vali tooy-e zaman-e ghanoni jam mishe, man hamoon baram kheyli arzeshesh bishtare.
If your project can be done within the timeframe but less improved, it would be more valuable to me.

47 S: ostad moshkel in-e ke man to moaddel
Professor, the problem is that my GPA

48 A: ishalla to darsay-e badi to termaye badi.
I hope [you would get high marks] in the next courses, in the next semesters.

49 S: akhe nemikham nomrasho az dast bedam chon bara man in dars baram mohemm-e. Darsti-ye ke moaddel-e man ro jabeja mikone. Man nemikham nomram, vagrane ke shoma...
I don’t want to miss out this mark as this course is important to me. This course’s mark can make a difference in my GPA. I don’t want my mark, but you…

Err I did tell you that I would help you in other ways to improve your project. But it’s not a problem if you won’t be a top student in the class. The other students might face problems and get low marks, and then their GPA would be lower than you. So not a problem.

51 S: yani hich rahi nadare ostad?
It means there is no way, Professor?

52 A: man goftam rah-e tamdid-e poroje vojood nadare.
I told you there is no way to extend the time.

53 S: hatta ye hafté? Hata 2 rooz 3 rooz?
Even a week? Even 2-3 days?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 54    | A: *magar, agar gharar bashe forsarti dade beshe, be hame dade mishe.*  
If any extension will be given, it would be given to all of the students. |
| 55    | S: *khob ostad be hame forsat bedin. Che eshkali dare?*  
So, Professor, give the extension to all students. What’s the matter? |
It can’t be. Because if it happens, it would always happen the same. |
| 57    | S: *hala ye bar.*  
Just one time. |
| 58    | A: *emtehan ye rooz-e moshakhas-e, poroje ye rooz moshakhkhas-e. Shoma befarmaeid man bahatoon, be man email bezanin yeki dota az doosta ro behetoon moarrefi mikonam ke bahatoon hamkari konan.*  
The final exam date is already fixed and the submission date is fixed, too. You can go and send me an email, I’ll then introduce one or two classmates/friends to you to assist you. |
| 59    | S: *ostad*  
Professor |
| 60    | A: *chon alan bache ha montazeran.*  
Because students are waiting. |
| 61    | S: *bashe chashm. Chashm kheyli mamnoon.*  
Okay. Thank you very much. |
| 62    | A: *ghorbanat.*  
Thanks. |
| 63    | S: *vali man miram agar nashod agar natoonestam sar-e saat, baz miyam hala shayad...*  
I’ll do it but if I can’t make, I’ll come back again. Well, maybe… |
| 64    | A: *hala fekr nakonam.*  
Well, I don’t think. |
| 65    | S: *man talash-e khodamo mikonam.*  
I do my best. |
### Role Play Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>A: bashe badan sohbat mikonim. Man say mikonam komaketoon bakonam dige kheyli ozro bahoonei namoone. Hala bebinim chejoori mishe, befarmaeid. Okay, we’ll discuss it later. I try to help you that there will be no excuses. Let’s see how it will be going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>S: kheyli mamnoon ostad. Thank you very much, Professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>01 Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad). Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>02 Mokhatab: bale? Addressee: Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03 S: salam ostad hal-e shoma? Khoob hastin? Hello Professor. How are you? Are you good?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04 A: salam. Hello.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 S: khosh migzare? Oza ahval? How are you doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06 A: salam agha-ye? Hello Mr?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07 S: man ‘ESM’ hastam. I am ‘FIRST NAME’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08 A: bale agha-ye ‘ESM’. Yes, Mr ‘FIRST NAME’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09 S: ba shoma dars bardashtam. Khoob hastin? I’ve taken a course with you. How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 A: khoobin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S: <em>ghorban-e shoma, mersi. Mozahem-e vaghtetoon ke nashodam?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincerely you, thanks. Didn’t I disturb you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A: <em>na na, khahesh mikonam. Befarmaein</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, no, welcome. Go ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S: <em>age ye vaght ehsas mikonin ke vaght</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you think that the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A: <em>na na, vaght daram.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, no, I have time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S: <em>ostad ye arzi dashtam khedmatetoon. Mikhastam begam oon poroje ee bood ke gharar bood dar vaghe tahvil bedimo ina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor, I had an appeal for you. I wanted to say [that] that project err which I am supposed to turn in and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A: <em>bara koodoo dars?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For which course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S: <em>bara hamin dars ke in term bardashtam.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the course I took this semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A: <em>dars-e...khob oohoom aha.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course... well. Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S: <em>darsi ke ba shomast.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The course which you are teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A: <em>shoma daneshjoo che sali hastin? Man khatram nist.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which year are you in? I don’t recall it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S: <em>man fekr konam... na yani bebakshid. Terem-e akharam.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think…no excuse me. I am in the final year of my study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aha, good. I know which project it is. Correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S: <em>are</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24 A: *khob?*  
So?

I wanted to say that the project is a bit dense. All the courses are sort of, the courses all I’ve taken in this semester are required. I can’t make it at all unless to turn in something like a mediocre work, that is…but we heard that err you expect a complete project. For that reason I can’t meet the deadline. I want to finish it. If it would be possible, either extend the time or think the other thing.

26 A: *negah konin in poroje haei ke hast, bishtar bara komak be khodeton-e. Man ina ro hala bara in nazashtam ke shoma ye joriri ino anjam bedin ke tamoom beshe bedid be man va ye nomre-ei begirin. Ina bara in-e ke roo mozo bishtar savor beshin, bishtar kar-e tahghighi anjam bedin. Negah konin, alan shoma 2 hafte vaght darin bara on kar ke tahvil bedin. Alan khob, entahana ham hast, har chand shoma belakhare bayad barnameye behtari mirikhtin, zoodtar ino shoro mikardin. Alan kari aslan darbarash anjam dadin ya...?*  
Look, these given projects are actually for yourself, they are to help you. I don’t want you to work on them in order to turn them in and get a mark. The projects are for learning more about these topics, and do more research. Look, you have 2 weeks to go to submit it. At present, well, there are final exams as well. However, you should have made a better schedule to start it earlier. Have you ever worked on it so far or…?

I reviewed the literature. Compiling them is easy, but it’s important what one should discuss and for example, what is your criterion is? I mean compiling them is super easy because it’s a research to be written up.

28 H: *hala moshkeleton, moshkel-e dars-e faghat? Ya...?*  
Is your problem only related to the project? Or…?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 29   | S: na.  
من چون درس‌های‌های تخصصی در این قرینه تا در حالت زیاد داشتم. یانی می‌خواهم که
berozi چیز کنام و مثلاً مدلام  
No. Because I have many other required courses in this semester. I mean I want to
do something that does not [affect] my GPA. |
| 30   | H: befarmaein beshinin.  
Please take a seat. |
Err it’s alright. Thank you. |
| 32   | H: khaheš.  
It’s alright. |
| 33   | S: chon in term man darsaei ke daram kheyli ziyad-e. Yani darsay-e takhassosi ke
daram, yeki inke bad moaddelam kheyli mohemm-e. Mamoolan agar ke in, chon ke
barnamam in-e ke darkhast bedam, bad mamoolan moaddel kheyli tasir dare. Vase
hamin, yani nemikham ke be har gheymati bashe. Hala ye meghdar aheste tar
bashe vali manteghi tar bashe. Injoriiya. Hala agar salah mibinin, agar na
mibinin, vaghean hich ejbari nist. Yani dar vaghe hich emkani nist va bayesti dar
asrae vaght amade beshe, belakhare ye joori amadash mikonam.  
Because I have other courses in this semester. I mean I have required courses so
my GPA is important. Generally, if that, because my plan is to apply for a job, then
GPA is generally effective. For that reason, I don’t want to make the situation hard
just because of keeping my GPA very good. Well, a little bit slower but more
reasonable. Like that. Well, if you realise, if you see no way, there is no pressure. It
means if there is actually no possibility and it must then be ready at the due time,
I’ll make it finally. |
| 34   | H: khob, man, midooni, ee {makes} man say nemikonam ke ye féshari biyaram ke,
be ghole khodet hala kar-e khoob tahvil nagiram akhar-e sar. Vali man ham kar-e
khoob mikhram ham zamanbandi-e khoob. Vali ee hala shoma ta akhar-e emtahana
ke mishe taghribenhoodood-e  
Well, I, you know, err {pause} I don’t want to put pressure, as you said, not to
receive a good piece in the end. But I want both a good work as well as time-
management. Well, but err until the end of the final exam period which will be
around |
| 35   | S: 4 hafe de dige  
Four weeks later |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 36    | H: 4 هفته دیگر. کهوب، چه‌دسته او نماید برای تو روزه کار کنیم؟  
       Four weeks later. Well, would this period of time work for you to work on it? |
| 37    | S: are  
       Yes |
| 38    | H: چون 2 هفته بعد از امتحانات وقت دارد و به‌طور صحیح کار کنیم.  
       Because you have two weeks after the exams, work on it properly. |
| 39    | S: چگونه کهوب با 2 هفته بعد از امتحانات باش، اره است. ممنون می‌شوم.  
       If well, it is two weeks after taking the final exams, yes it’d be possible. I’m thankful. |
| 40    | H: کهوب کهوب‌ه؟  
       Well, alright? |
| 41    | S: are، فکر می‌کنم.  
       Yes, I think so. |
| 42    | H: کهوب انجوری-یه، منم سخت نمی‌گیرم حالا در مورد. ولی کهوب کهوب می‌خشم دیگر ازتون.  
       Well, if it is like that, I am not fussy in this case. But I want an improved project from you. |
| 43    | S: هن باد کهوب منزوورتون؟  
       Well, so you mean? |
| 44    | H: کهوب نگاه، کاری که تووش اه معلوم باشه که شما رفتین تغییر کاریدن،  
       کهوندی، یه چیزی نه‌شته که منابع داشته باشی، معلوم باشه چه موژو رو فهمیدی، موده‌دامی یا ناتایجو مفهوم می‌گه. من وقتی می‌خونم مفهوم مانم. بنابراین تجربه‌ی خامنه‌ی این سالان باش و من متنی که می‌خوانم فهمم، از آن جهت باید کار کنیم.  
       Well look, if you err put efforts into the project you’re working on and look for different sources, study different articles, it shows you understand the topic and I will realise that from the introduction, and result and discussion parts. My teaching experiences over these years taught me whether you worked properly or not. |
| 45    | S: باید همان تایپه کنم یا درونه…؟  
       Do I have to type the project or that…? |
Look, there are some students that type their works for a long time and they are pretty fast. There are other students that they are beginners. I don’t insist to type it but if you can do it, it’s easier for me and also good for your future [career], because you wouldn’t email handwritten documents; you have to type them. I prefer to get a work which is typed but if it is really difficult for you, you can turn in a handwritten one, but just a neat handwriting that I can read it {smile}

S: bad ostad nomrehaye on dars ke khodetoon dashtin in termo, key amade mishe?
Professor, when are our final exam results going to be ready?

A: oonam yek hafte bad az emtahan.
A week after your exam.

S: aha. Bad emtahanesh fekr nemikonin ye khorde vaghtesh kam-e?
Don’t you think that the time of the exam is a bit short?

A: zaman-e khod-e emtahan?
The time of giving the exam?

S: are yani az ghabi ke, emtahane ghablish.
Yes, the period between our last exam and this exam.

A: aha ye rooz fasele ro migi?
Aha, do you mean one day between the exams?

S: are
Yes

Well, look, it’s like that. Look, you before, because if you want to study all the courses in the exam break, that would be very hard. Because generally, the university manages exams for 2 weeks.

55 S: oohoom
   Aha

And the best scenario is only 2 days interval between the exams which is not enough to study your next exam and get a good mark. You have to make a schedule already and start your studying already. And the days before the exam is for reviewing it. And it is not what I can help you with. This time management is done by

57 S: bakhsh-e amoozesh-e
   Section of education

58 A: amoozesh-e.
   Education.

   Great! Thanks. Appreciated.

60 A: khahehs mionam. Khahesh mikonam.
   Most welcome. No worries.

61 S: moteshakker.
   Thank you.

62 A: ishala ke emtahanam khoob bedido
   I hope you take your exam well and

63 S: mersi.
   Thanks.

64 A: va montazer-e porojetoonam hastim.
   And look forward to your project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 65 S: bashe, mersi. Kheyli mamnoon.  
Okay, thanks. Thank you very much. |
| 66 A: kharesh mikonam.  
Most welcome. |
Appreciated. Thank you. Goodbye. |
| 68 A: khodanegahdar.  
Goodbye. |
| 12 LL | 01 Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).  
Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door). |
| 02 Mokhatab: befarmaein.  
Addressee: Come in please. |
| 03 S: salam agha-ye doctor.  
Hello Mr Dr. |
| 04 A: salam aleykum.  
Hello. |
| 05 S: hal-e shoma? Khoob hastin?  
How are you today? |
| 06 A: hal-e shoma? Khoob hastin?  
How are you today? |
| 07 S: rozeton bekheyr.  
Good day. |
| 08 A: ya allah.  
Most welcome. |
| 09 S: motshaker. Zende bashin.  
Thank you. Long life to you. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A: khoob hastin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S: mishe beshinam?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May I sit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A: kahesh mikonam, befarmaein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No problem, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S: mersi. Mamnoon. Shoma khoobin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanks. Thank you. How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A: mersi. Mamnoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S: roozeton khoob boode?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you had a nice day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A: salamat bashin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you very busy? Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, we’re working. It’s not bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S: oza ahval pas khoob-e dige. Khob khoda ro shokr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So everything is going alright. That’s very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A: mamnoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S: valla gharz az mozahemat omadam ke in dars-e ‘zamin shenasi 1’ ke in term bardshtim, in poroje ke midoonid ke raje be anvae sangha dar nimkore jonobi bayad tahghigh konim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reason that I disturbed you is that because in the course ‘Geology 1’ that I took in the first semester, as you know, the project is about different types of stones in South Island which I have to work on/do research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23 | S: *bale*
Yes |
| 24 | A: *mozoo-e khoobi-ye.*
That’s a good topic. |
I’ve done most of the work, [but] unfortunately only one of the machines [I’m working with] in the lab does not work properly. They’ll come to fix it so I can’t discuss the results and finish the work at the due date for submission. The deadline is by the end of Khordad (March). |
| 26 | A: *khob?*
So? |
| 27 | S: *mikhastam bebinam age emkan dare ke man in...ye meghdari shoma be man mohlat bedin ta bebinim dastghah chejoori mishe ozash.*
I was wondering if it would be possible that I… you give me more time to see how the machine will be going. |
| 28 | A: *ino bayad ta*
This must be |
| 29 | S: *data ha ro ezafe konam, benevisam, tahvil bedam.*
I would enter the data, write [the result] and submit it. |
| 30 | A: *ino bayad behem forsat bedin sohat konam ba asatid.*
You have to bear with me to talk about this problem with other professors. |
| 31 | S: *ba masoolan*
With the staff in charge |
| 32 | A: *ba masoolin sohat konam ta be moghe in dastgaha ro dorostesh konan.*
I speak to the staff in charge to fix it on time. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 S: bale. Pas chon ke oon mohlati ke dadin bad nomreha gharar-e chiz beshe?</td>
<td>Yes. So because you have assigned the deadline, then what happens to the [projects’] mark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 A: na na negarane oon nabashin.</td>
<td>No no, don’t worry about that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 S: ahan man goftam...</td>
<td>Aha, I said…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 A: chon taghsir-e shoma naboode.</td>
<td>Because it wasn’t down to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 S: are dorost-e.</td>
<td>Yes, right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 A: chon dar vaghe ye irad-e daneshgahi boode. Ino bayad, bayad bartarf beshe.</td>
<td>Because this is the problem caused from the university, it must be sorted out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 S: age ye zamani nashod dastgah ta oon tarihk-e khordad mah tamoom nashod, man in taklif-e nomram chejoori mishe oonvaght?</td>
<td>If the machine wouldn’t be fixed until March (deadline), then what would happen to my mark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 A: taklif-e nomrat eee ta oonja ke dast-e man-e, man name negari mikonam, say mikonam ke ino be etela-e masoolin beresoonam ke haghi az shoma zaye nashe.</td>
<td>Your mark err as far as I can help it, I will check it with people in charge and give a report that you don’t lose your right [mark].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 S: dast-e shoma dard nakone.</td>
<td>Appreciate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 A: chon shoma to in vasat moghaser naboodin. Irad dar vaghe irad-e daneshkadei boode. Va age, age nashood dige, ino bayad az ye rahhaye dige peygiri konim bebinim ke chi mishe.</td>
<td>Because the problem is not from your side. Indeed, this is from the department. And if, if it wouldn’t be sorted out, we have to report to other sections to see how it’ll be going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 S: bale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 44    | A: *vali negaran nabashin shoma. Say miknim ke dorostesh konim.*  
But don’t worry. We try to sort it out. |
| 45    | S: *dast-e shoma dard nakone. Kheyli mamnoon.*  
Appreciate it. Thank you very much. |
| 46    | A: *kharesh mikonam.*  
No problem. |
| 47    | S: *age ejaze bedin man rafe zahmat konam.*  
If you permit me, I leave [the office]. |
| 48    | A: *kharesh mikonam. Moafagh bashin.*  
No worries. Good luck. |
| 49    | S: *mamnoonam. Khodanegahdar.*  
Thank you. Goodbye. |
| 50    | A: *khodahafez-e shoma.*  
Goodbye. |
| 13    | HH |
| 01    | S: *salam ostad.*  
Hello Professor. |
| 02    | A: *alaykumo salam.*  
Hello. |
| 03    | S: *hal-e shoma khoob-e?*  
How are you? |
| 04    | A: *mamnoon.*  
Thank you. |
| 05    | S: *mmm, ost {mokhatab mipare vasat}  
Umm Prof {interrupted by the addressee} |
| 06    | A: *befarmaein.*  
Yes, please. |
### Role Play Conversations

| Pairs | 07 | S: ostad man haghightesh omadam raje be in poroje bahaton sohbat konam ke gharar-e tahvil bedam.  
I came here to talk about my project which I’m going to turn in. |
|-------|----|----|
|       | 08 | A: koodoo poroje? koodoo poroje? koodoo dars?  
Which project? Which project? Which course? |
|       | 09 | S: hamin poroje-ye darsi mmm ‘fiziology’.  
That project for the course umm ‘Physiology’ |
|       | 10 | A: ‘fiziology 2’ ya ‘1’ (ESM-e VAHED-e DARSI)?  
‘Physiology 2’ or ‘1’ (COURSE’s NAME)? |
|       | 11 | S: 2.  
2. |
|       | 12 | A: 2, ahan, khob. Chi shode?  
2, okay. So what’s wrong? |
|       | 13 | S: man ta akhar-e hafte mohlat daram vali motassefane natoonestam amade konam.  
Mikham bebinam age lotf konid ye mohlat-e dige bedin tamdid konin.  
The deadline is by the end of this week but unfortunately I can’t make it. I wonder if you kindly do me a favour [and] extend it. |
|       | 14 | A: ta akhar-e hafte? chand rooz dige darim ta akhar-e hafte?  
By the end of this week? How many days to go until the weekend? |
|       | 15 | S: 2 rooz-e dige.  
Two more days to go. |
We have two more days. What’s the problem? What’s the issue? |
|       | 17 | S: moshkel {mokhatab mipare vasat}  
The problem {interrupted by the addressee} |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18 A: *shoma ye mah vaght dashti alan avordi?! Age moshkeli bood chera nayomadi zoodtar be man begi ya inke moshkel?*  
You had one month, and now you come?! If you had a problem, why didn’t you discuss it with me earlier? | |
| 19 S: *are shoma*  
Yes, you | |
| 20 A: *chejoori pish*  
How | |
| 21 S: *hagh ba shomast vali ye seri moshkelat-e khonevadegi dashtam {sorfa}*  
You’re right but I’ve got a kind of family issue {coughing} | |
| 22 A: *khob! Man tooy-e kelas goftam rooz-e avval agar moshkel-e khoonevadegi, marizi, bimari, har chizi hast, ina roo zood be man begid. Yani daghighan hamoon moghei ke in masale etefagh oftad, moshkel pish amad. Ya age ye moshkeli dashti az oon avval ke khob bayad miomadi hamoon avval-e class behem migofii ke {nafas-e amigh} man ba in moshkelat daram dasto panje narm mikonam dar eyn-e halam daram dars mikhonam.*  
Well! I told the class that if you have any family issues, illness, sickness or anything else, come and discuss them with me earlier. I meant when problems happened, you had exactly been stuck in. Or if you have had this problem earlier, you should have let me know from the beginning that {deep breathing} you have been struggling with these problems while you were studying. | |
| 23 S: *fekr mikardam ke*  
I thought that | |
| 24 A: *man ina ro be vozooh goftam jalase avval, dorsote?*  
I talked about these clearly in the first session of the class, didn’t I? | |
| 25 S: *bale dorost-e. Man fekr mikardam ke mitoonam tamoom konam vali khob hala rasid be akharesh, mibinam hanooz kheyli kar moond-e va*  
Yes, that’s right. I thought I could finish it but well, it’s now so close to the deadline and I see there are more work to do and | |
| 26 A: *fekr konid cheghadr dige? Chand rooz dige lazem darid ezafe bar sazman?*  
Think how much time more? How many extra days do you need? | |
<p>| 27 S: <em>50% ro bishtar kar nakardam.</em> | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only 50% of the work has been done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 A: khob in akhe monsefane nist raje be baghiye. Baghiye ke kar kardan shabane roozo be ghole maroof resoondan sar-e vaght hatta zoodtar az...tahvil dadan. Moshkel chi-ye hala be man begoo? Moshkel chi-ye? Mitooni moshkeleo be man begi? Masale chi-ye ke aghab negahet dashte? Well, it is not fair to other students. They have worked day and night, will meet the deadline and turn in their projects, and have turned it in even before the due date. Tell me what’s the problem? What’s the problem? Can you tell me what your problem is? What keeps you behind?

29 S: hamoon be har hal goftam. Ye seri moshkelat-e khonevadegi ast. It is the same problem that I said. It’s a kind of family issue.

30 A: moshkelat-e khonevadegio inast. Mmm 2 rooz 3 rooz dige darim sayeto bokon bebinam. bad az 2-3 rooz biyar bebinam cheghadr karet, chaghadr pish rafte to in 2 rooz. Motanaseb-e ba on say mikonam ye meghdar vaght-e ezafi behet bedam. Faghat in mozoo beyn-e khodemoon bashe. Dige be baghiye pakhsh nakon, be baghiye nago. ‘fiziology 2’ bood dige, dorost-e? The family issue or like that. Umm we have two or three more days, do your best. After 2-3 days bring it (your draft) to see how much progress you have made within these 2 days. Based on your progress, then I would give you an extension. Just keep this between you and me. Don’t share it with others. It is ‘Physiology 2’, right?

31 S: bale Yes

32 A: chon man dota kelas-e kheyli bozorg daram, are. In behtarin komaki-ye ke mitoonam behet bokonam. Zarf-e mmm in, to in 2-3 rooz-e baghi mooned sayeto bokon begam ghashang pish beri, cheghadr mitooni pish bebari bad mishinim ye negahi mikonim. Ghol behet nemidam ke mitoonam behet ye tool, ye moddat-e toolani bedam nahayat ye 2 ta 3 rooz dige behet ezafe bedam ke be harhal bayad jamojoresh koni tamoomesh koni. Ehmalam az khodet boode ke nayoomadi avvalesh behem begi moshkelat dashti. Onjoori age migofi man mitoonestam ye chiz-e, ye meghdar saboktar behet bedam ya inke az oon hamoon avval ye meghdar vaghto toolani konam ya be to forsat-e bishtari bedam chon in be digaran monsefane nist. Because I have two overcrowded classes. This is the best I can do for you. Whithin umm 2-3 days, do you best, make big progress. Then we’ll sit together and check how much progress you’ve had. I don’t promise you a long
extension, I’ll give you a 2-3-day extension at maximum that you will have to finish it. It’s your mistake that you didn’t tell me earlier, because if I knew it earlier, I could have changed the topic for you or extended the deadline for everyone or given extra time to yourself because it’s not now fair.


34 A: talasheto bokon pas yani 2-3 rooz balke tamoooom kardi. Age tamoomam nashodam hala mibinim vali on eee entezar daram ke in 2-3 rooz kar-e in ye maho betooni ye jooraei be har hal anjam bedi ke age bekhay va sayeto bokoni. So do your hardest, it means in 2-3 days, maybe you finish it. If it’s not been done, then we’ll see but err I expect you to be able to improve it in 2-3 days that if you want and try [your best].

35 S: pas man shanbe mitoonam khedmatetoon beresam? So I can come and see you on Saturday?

36 A: shanbe man are. Badaz zohr. 2 badaz zohr man injam, sobh vaght nadaram. 2 badaz zohr. Saturday, yes. Afternoon. I am in on Saturday afternoon at 2.00. I am busy in the morning. At 2.00.

37 S: chashm. Okay.

38 A: bashe. Alright.

39 S: kheyli mamnoon. Thank you very much.

40 A: be salamat. Movaffagh bashi. Good luck.

41 S: khodahafez. Goodbye.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LL    | **01** *Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).*  
Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door). |
|       | **02** *Mokhatab: befarmaein.*  
Addressee: Come in please. |
|       | **03** S: salam arz mikonom.  
Hello. |
|       | **04** A: salam aleykum.  
Hello. |
|       | **05** S: khaste nabashin ostad.  
This expression does not exist in English. (more power to your elbow). It’s used to grab someone’s attention. |
|       | **06** A: hal-e shoma chetoore?  
How are you? |
|       | **07** S: alhamdollelah, motshakeram. Bebakhshnin mozahem shodam, ye arzi dashtam.  
I am good, thank you. Sorry if I disturb you, I had an appeal [for you]. |
|       | **08** A: Janam?  
Yes? |
|       | **09** S: man babate poroje-ye in dars ke khedmatetoon daram, mozahem shodam.  
Tebgh-e oon chizi ke az avval-e term gofte shode, ma bayad ta akhar-e in term poroje ro tahvil bedim vali haghighatesh in-e ke ma darsay-e dige ham dashtim va hajm-e tahghighi ke bayad anjam beshe ham ziyade. Man kheyli talash kardam vali haghighatesh ehtemal midam ke natoonam ta akhar-e term poroje ro tamoom konam. Ya hadeaghal oontor ke khodam mikham natoonam tamoom konam.  
I disturbed you to talk about the project I have with you. According to the deadline which has been fixed at the beginning of the semester, we have to submit the project by the end of this semester but actually, we have other courses and I can’t probably finish it by that date. Or I can’t write it up as I would like. |
|       | **10** A: dorost-e. Agha-ye ‘FAMIL’ boodi? Dorost-e?  
Right. Are you Mr ‘FAMILY NAME’? Right? |
|       | **11** S: ‘FAMIL’ hastam.  
I am ‘FAMILY NAME’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 S:</td>
<td>`befarmaeid beshinid. Please take a seat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 A:</td>
<td>`na mozhahem nemisham. No, I’m fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 S:</td>
<td>`bebakhshid. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 S:</td>
<td>`bebakhshid. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 A:</td>
<td>`befarmaeid beshinid. Please take a seat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 S:</td>
<td>`khahesh mikonam. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 A:</td>
<td>`mozooeton chi boode? What’s your project about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 A:</td>
<td>`dorost-e. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 S:</td>
<td>`ye poroje-ei bood ke ye narm afzari gharar bood benevisam babat-e in. Monteha ehtemal midam ke naresam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am supposed to write about an application in this project but I don’t think I have enough time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A: dorost-e. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>S: ta akhar-e term. Baray-e hamin mik hastam az hozoo retoon kha hesh konam {mokhatab mipare vasat} By the end of the term. For that reason I wanted to request you {interrupted by the addressee}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A: cheghadr vaght dari alan? How much time do you have now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>S: alan hodoode 3 hafte. About three weeks from now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A: 3 hafte...khob cheghadr vaght mikhay? Three weeks. Well, how much time do you need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S: fekr mikonam age ye mah-e dige vaghto bishtar konin, beto onam keyfiyyat-e beh atri tahvil bedam. I think if you extend the time to a month, I can submit an improved project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A: yani yek hafte? Ye mah bad az 3 hafte? Ya ba 3 hafte yek mah? You meant 1 week? Or 1 month after 3 weeks? Or is one month totally with 3 weeks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S: na, yek mah bad az 3 hafte. No, one month after 3 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A: yek mah bad az 3 hafte! {maks} eee motmaeni mitooni jame sh bokoni? A month after 3 weeks! {pause} err are you sure you can finish it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S: man dar vaghe tooy-e 3 hafte ham mitoomam ye poroje ro be nahvi tahvil bedam vali oon keyfiyyat ke khodam delam mikhad nemishe. Actually, I can submit the project within 3 weeks but not a significantly improved one as I would like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A: dorost-e. Right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35 S: *in-e ke...*
   That is…

36 A: *man ye meghdar az karato khondam, khoob boode.*
   I’ve looked at a part of your work [which] has been good.

37 S: *lotf darin.*
   Thank you.

38 A: *are khoob boode. Albate man kheyli daneshjoo-ye, be ghole maroof nemishnasam ghablan. Fekr konam yeki 2 bar ba man dars dashti.*
   Yes, it’s been good. But I don’t know you very well. I think you’ve taken only one or two courses with me.

39 S: *bale, ziyad nadashtam.*
   Yes, I haven’t taken many.

40 A: *vali didam karet khoob boode. Khoob dari talash mikoni.*
   But I know you’re working well. You’re making good progress.

41 S: *lotf darid.*
   Appreciated.

42 A: *bashe man ta oonjaei ke be ghole maroof betoonam komaket mikonam, err vaght behet midam.*
   Okay, I’ll help you as much as I can, err extend the time.

43 S: *lotf darid.*
   Appreciated.

44 A: *vali say kon ke dige poshtkar dashte bashi tamoomesh bokoni.*
   But do your best to finish it.

45 S: *hatman, hatman.*
   Sure, of course.

46 A: *chon dige man bishtar az in nemitoonam. Ba karay-e digam dargir mishe.*
   Because I can’t help it more than this. It will be mess up.

47 S: *lotf darin. Bale hatman.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th><strong>Role Play Conversations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciated. Yes, sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>A: <em>dige hajm-e kara, dige nemitoonam be karay-e shoma beresam ke forsat dashte basham be ghole maroof ghesmat be ghesmat bekhonam oon porojato.</em> Because the amount of the work, I can’t work more on your project and look at the details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>S: <em>chashm. Hatman man tooy-e oon modat mogharar oon poroje ro tamoom mikonam.</em> Okay. definitely I’ll finish the project within this given time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>A: <em>inshalah.</em> I do hope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>S: <em>khedmateton erae mikonam.</em> Submit it to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A: <em>inshalah. Hala in akahrin kario ke anjam dadi, ta oonjaciem ke resoondi, inam ye gozareshi baram benevis</em> Hope so. When you get it done, what you’ve completed, also write the report for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>A: <em>ke man bebinam chikar kardi va chikar mitoonam barat bokonam.</em> That I can check (track) what you’ve done and how I can assist you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>S: <em>hatman khedmateton arz mikonam.</em> Sure, I’ll send it to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>A: <em>khahest mikonam.</em> It is alright.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S: <em>yek donya tashkor.</em> A huge thank you (Thanks a million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>A: <em>ghorban-e shoma.</em> Sincerely yours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>S: <em>mozahem nabashm.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Role Play Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t disturb you anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>A: <em>khahesh mikonam. Befarma chai.</em>  &lt;br&gt;Most welcome. Please have a tea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>A: <em>khahesh mikonam.</em>  &lt;br&gt;Most welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>S: <em>ba ejazatoon.</em>  &lt;br&gt;With your permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Gooyande: <em>tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).</em>  &lt;br&gt;Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Mokhatab: <em>befarmaein.</em>  &lt;br&gt;Addressee: Come in please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>S: <em>salam aghye doctor.</em>  &lt;br&gt;Hello Mr Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>A: <em>salam. Ahval-e shoma?</em>  &lt;br&gt;Hello. How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>S: <em>bebakhshid mozahem-e vaghtetoon shodam.</em>  &lt;br&gt;Sorry I disturbed you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>A: <em>khahesh mikonam. Janam?</em>  &lt;br&gt;No problem. Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>S: <em>man in darso ro in term ba shoma daram. In poroje-ei ke gharar-e be shoma tahvil bedim. Vagheiyatesh kheyli sangin-e. Man fekr nemikonam betoonam beresonam. Emkan-e in hast ke betoonim vaghtesh ro ye meghdar tamdidesh konim? Chon vaghean karesh, kar-e ziyadi mibare va nemidoonam vaghean bayad chikar konam.</em>  &lt;br&gt;I have taken this course with you in this semester. The project that I am going to turn in. It’s a bit dense. I don’t think I can make it. Would it be possible to extend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the time a bit? Because it would take a while and I don’t really know what to do for that.

08 A: eee bebinid poroje ro ke ma tanzim kardin, baray-e dar vaghe vaziyate normal-e daneshjooyan ro tebegg-e sanavat-e sal-e gozashte dar nazar migirim ke aksariyyat-e daneshjooyan ba in zaman moshkeli naslakhtan. Hala ke shoma moshkel baratooon pish omade, ghaedatan neshoon mide ke oon reval-e tabeiei ro tey nakarde ya inke hajm-e ziyadi az kar ro moo Kol kardin be akhar-e vaght. Alan daghighan chera in moshkel bara shoma pish oomade?
Err look, the assigned project is considered based on the last years’ records that most of the students did not have any problem with the timeframe. The problem you’ve got shows that you have not started your work on a normal schedule or have postponed most of your workloads for the last minute. Indeed, why have you got this problem?

09 S: eee khob man ham dars hay-e dige daram, ham inke hamin, in karam baram sangin bood. Yani ye meghdar ba mozoesh moshkel dashtam aslan kollan. Ye meghdar bara hamin vaght-e bishtari mikham ke betoonam jobran konam.
Err because I have other classes and also this project is a bit dense for me. I mean the topic is a bit hard for me. Because of that I want more time to make it up (to complete it).

10 A: aya…man khabardar hastam ke bazi daneshjooha tonestan be soorat-e gorohi masalan baham karo pish bebaran. Aya shoma fardi karo donbal kardin? Ya inke natoonestin ba hamkelasihay-e digaton va be har hal ye kar-e mosharekati ro dashte bashid?
Are…I know that some of the students are doing a team work for this project. Are you working on your project individually? Or couldn’t you find any other partner to do group work possibly?

11 S: man be shakhs-e fardi kar mikonam. Kas-e khasi ro kheyli nemishnasam ke betoonam bahashoon kar konam.
I am working on it individually. I don’t personally know my classmates very much to work with them.

12 A: bebinid inke man bekham baray-e shoma monhaseran ye vaght-e ezafe-ei ro dar nazar begiram, khob yek meghdar kharej az orf va zavabet-e daneshgasht. Shayad be baghiye dostan-e shoma ham yek ejahe heshe eee magar inke dar vaghe ma bekhaym yek vaght ro be soorat-e kali dar nazar begirim. Ala ayohal shoma ejahe…man toosiyam be shoma ine: shoma karetono bebarin ta oojaee ke miteenid bebarid jolo. Dar entehaye, yani dar zamani ke ma darim be mohlat nazdik
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mishim, agar doostan-e dige-ei ham mesl-e shoma moraje-e kardan va darkhast-ha be nahvi bood ke man ehsas kardam ke khob tedad-e ghabel-e molaeze-ei ya inke masalan yek bakhshi az doostan khob in moshkelo dashtan, be har hal onvaght fekr-e ye chara mikonom. Vali agar serfan shoma bekhayn dar vaghe in mozo ro dashte bashin alaraghme tedad-e ziad-e daneshjooyani ke hastan, oonvaght moshkel be shoma barmigarde.</td>
<td>Look, if I want to give an extra time, well, it is out of norm and the university rules. Perhaps it’d also be unfair to other students err unless we give this extra time to all of the students. However, you let me…my present suggestion to you is: keep going on your project as much as you can. In the end, when we’re close to the deadline, if other students have got the same problem as yours that I feel that the number of requests were significant but not a small number, then I will think of a way and sort it out anyway. But if you will be the only person who got this problem compared to the number of students are in the class, then the problem will be back to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: eee doctor hamaro shoma nemitoonin akhe yejoori negah konin. Momken-e baghiya aslan ba in dars kheyli rahat boode bashan. Inke masalan... Err Doctor, you can’t treat students’ situation in a same manner. Perhaps the other students have learnt this course easily. For example, that…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: be har hal bebinin, man in dars ro dar sanavt-e gozashte ham dashtam shayad alan chandin term hast ke man in dars ro daram tadris mikonom. Be har hal natayej-e in chand term-e gozashte neshoon mide ke in dars baray-e gharib be etefagh-e daneshjooyan kheyli sangin mahsoob nemishe. Mipaziram sobbate-shoma ro, dars-e sade-ei nist vali ingoone ham nistesh ke faghat shoma dar tool-e masalan chandin termni ke man tadris dashtam jozve daneshjooyani bashid ke bekhayed in darso sangin ghalamdad konin. Vali man baz ham alaraghme in mozo betoonam dar vaghe kari az dastam barbiyad, migam ba zavabet-e daneshgah moshkeli nadashte bashe...nahaytan ejaze bedid in modat tey beshe, man dar entehaye kar bebinam ke in zaman bandi baray-e baghiye daneshjooyan chetoor khahad bood. Oonvaght ye tasmin-e mokhtasari khedmateton elam mikonom. Anyhow, look, I have been teaching this course for several semesters. Based on these last semesters’ record, this project was not difficult for most of the past or current students. We accept your words [that] this course is not easy but it’s not akind of much difficult to pass it that you want to tag this label for it. However, if I can do anythingto do for you which does not break the university rules…finally, let the time goes by, [let me] see how the time management is going for other students. Then I will inform you the final brief decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: kheyli mamnoonam agha-ye doctor. Lotf mikonin. Thank you very much, Professor. Appreciated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Role Play Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | 16 A: *zende bashin.*  
Long life to you.  

|       | 17 S: *motahakarm.*  
Thank you.  

|       | 18 A: *ghorban-e shoma.*  
Sincerely yours.  

|       | 19 S: *ba ejazatoon.*  
With your permission.  

|       | 20 A: *be salamat.*  
Most welcome.  

|       | 21 S: *khodahafez-e shoma.*  
Goodbye.  

|       | 22 A: *ghorban-e shoma. Khodanegahdar.*  
Sincerely yours. Goodbye.  

|   | 01 *Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).*  
Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door).  

|   | 02 *Mokhatab: befarmaein.*  
Addressee: Come in please.  

|   | 03 S: *salam ostad.*  
Hello professor.  

|   | 04 A: *salam.*  
Hello.  

|   | 05 S: *hal-e shoma khoob-e?*  
How are you?  

|   | 06 A: befarmaein. Khahesh mikonam  
Welcome. Please.  

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07 S: khoob hastin?</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 A: kheyli mamnoon.</td>
<td>[I am good] Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 S: ghorban-e shoma.</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 S: khahesh mikonam. Ye chand deghighe-ei mik hastam vaghteton ro begiram agar eshkal nashe bashe?</td>
<td>Thank you. I want to take up a few minutes of your time if it’s okay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 S: midoonam ke sareton kheyli shoolooghe.</td>
<td>I know you are very busy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 A: Eshkal ke dare vali hala befarmaein.</td>
<td>I do mind, but please go ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A: bale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 S: ke eee ta akhar-e term mohlatesh hast ke anjam bedim. Eee..</td>
<td>Which err the submission deadline is by the end of the semester. Err…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 A: anjam nadadin ishala dige?</td>
<td>You haven’t done that I think so?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 S: {labkhand} valla anjam ke doost daram bedam vali moteaselfane ye mmm seri moshkelati hast, ye seri masaeli daram ke err fekr mikonam ke natoonam beresam ke tooy-e oon mohlat-e err mogharari ke, bale shoma farmoodin anjamesh bedam. {smile} Actually I would love to do that but unfortunately umm there are a few problems that err I think I can’t finish it by err the deadline which you have assigned.


21 S: bad bara hamin khedmateton residam bebinam ke rahi dare, mishe kari kard? Ye meghdari hala mohlat-e man ro baram ye kam masalan yeki 2 hafte ham agar ke betoonin, be man mohlat bishtar bedid bara man khoob-e. Midoonam albate bayad sar-e moghe tahvil midadam vali dige nashod. For that reason, I came that I wonder is there any way? Is it possible to do anything for it? A bit more time, if you can extend the time for me for example a week or two weeks, it’d be good for me. Of course, I know I should have submitted at the due time but I can’t.

22 A: dorost-e. Valla cheghadr fekr mikoni ke zaman niyaz dashte bashi ta tamoom beshe? Right. How much time do you think you need to finish it?

23 S: man fekr mikonam dige agar ke eshkal nadashte bashe 2 hafte ro man fekr konam betoonam. Yani ba ye hafte ham mishe vali khoob age 2 hafte bashe, kheyli aliye. I think if that’s okay, I think I can do it in within 2 weeks. It means I can get it done within a week but if there is a 2-week extension, that’d be great.

24 A: dorost-e. Khoob age betoonin tooy-e ye hafte err anjam bedin ke kheyli behtar-e. Right. If you can do it within err a week, that’d be better.

25 S: bale Yes

26 A: ke man dar haghihat hala ye joraei ba porojehaye baghiye bacheha hadeaghal kheyli ektelaf-e zamani nadashte bashin. Indeed, not to have a far timing difference with [submitting] other projects.

27 S: bale Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pairs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Role Play Conversations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A: <em>tarjihan age betoonin to ye hafte anjam bedin ke kehyli behtar-e. Vali hala age vaghean natoonestido dige err sharayetesh nabood ke khob biyarin to hamon 2 hafte vali dige dirtar nashe dige az on zaman.</em> Preferably if you can do it in a week, it’d be much better. But if you couldn’t do err [and] the situation wasn’t okay, turn it in two weeks at maximum but not more than that extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S: <em>na na, dige motmaenan dige dirtar nemishe. Dast-e shoma ham dard nakone.</em> No no, I’m sure it won’t be later than that. Thanks very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A: <em>khahesh mikonam.</em> No worries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S: <em>loftetono faramosh nemikonam.</em> I do not forget your favour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S: <em>midoonam ke nabayad inkaro mikardam vali dar har soorat kheyli kheyli mamnoonam.</em> I know I shouldn’t have asked this [extension] but thank you very very much though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S: <em>ghorban-e shoma.</em> Sincerely yours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A: <em>salamt bashin.</em> Most welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>S: <em>ejaze mifarmaein?</em> Do you permit me [to leave your office]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A: <em>ghorban-e shoma.</em> Most welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincerely yours. With your permission. Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A: khodanegahdareton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Mokhatab: befarmaein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressee: Come in please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>S: agha-ye doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>A: bah agha-ye ‘ESM’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr ‘FIRST NAME’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>S: khaaste nabashin. Khoobin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>A: salamat bashin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I [had]… Did I disturb you? I had a little thing for you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>A: na befarmaein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Go ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>S: ke bayad ye bahsi bahaton bokonam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That I should discuss [it] with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A: befarmaein befarmaein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go ahead, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S: bashe mersi. Avval ke be hozooreton ke err</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okay, thanks. First err…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A: nemikhayn beshinin agha-ye ‘FAMIL’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t you want to take a seat Mr ‘FAMILY NAME’?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pairs  |  Role Play Conversations
---|---
13  | S: *dastetoon dard nakone, mersi. Bebakhshid.*
   | Appreciated. Thanks. Excuse me
14  | A: *kahesh mikonam.*
   | Most welcome.
   | I don’t want to take up too much of your time but err I disturbed you for the final project. Err it should have been finished by the deadline for which you’ve assigned a date. I err think, you surely know I am in the second year of my master’s program. The required courses are still to be taken in this semester. Err I can’t turn it in by the deadline unfortunately but can do it close to this date {pause}
16  | A: *cheghadr, cheghadr fasele?*  
   | How much time [how many extra days]?
   | I {pause} I think if a week or 10 days, I try [to do it] in a week. I can do it by the end of this week, if you give me one more week. I don’t know. If you recall, I’ve attended all your classes [and] did all the assignments. Unfortunately, {pause} I can turn it in on time but it can’t be like I would like to. It might not be good [to say this], but I can copy a project or find one from somewhere but I would like to do this project because I like your course. I would like to do an original work. A bit more time than what you’ve actually given to me.
18  | A: *mosheleetoon chi hast faghat?*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 S: <strong>hamoontori ke goftam man term-e 4 hastam, sal dovomiam. Dare taghriban tanoom mishe. Ye seri darsay-e najoor baghi ham monde, ro baghiye ha ham bayad kar konam. Na inke bekhah bahane biyaram ke baghiye mohemtaran, vali 2-3 ta dars haei ke monde hamashoon mohemman. Roo hame-am bayad kar beshe. Shoma ham ke dige inja dars midin ashnaein payan term ha hame mamoolan nazdik-e haman, ba 2-3 rooz ekhtelaf-e. Oonaei ham ke Bekham payan nameha ro azashoon begiram oona ham hame nazdik-e ham-e poroje ha. Bara hamin ye kam, ye kam hamechi ghati shode bood. Man age betoonam, age beshe bishtar vaght gozasht ke, kheyli behtar-e.</strong> As I said, I am in the fourth semester, in the second year. I am about to end [the degree]. There are a lot of projects to work on. I didn’t say this to make an excuse that other projects are more important than this but there are 2-3 courses which are important and I have to work on them as well. You teach here and are familiar with the process. The final exams all are usually close to each other with just 2-3 days distance. The ones that I would like to choose for my thesis topic are close to each other. A bit busy schedule. If I can, if it’d be possible to spend more time on it, it’d be much better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 A: <strong>khob ye hafte 10 rooz kafi-ye?</strong> Well, a week [or] 10 days is enough?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 S: <strong>are</strong> Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 A: <strong>ya inke bad az ye hafte 10 rooz shoma mikhay begt ke...?</strong> Or after one-week or 10-day extension, do you want to say that…?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 S: <strong>na na na. Man ye hafte ta 10 rooz-e harjoori bashe tamoomesh mikonam.</strong> No no no. I do my hardest to finish it up in a week to 10 days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 A: <strong>iradi nadare. Agar ye hafte ta 10 rooz-e, moshkeli nist.</strong> It’s alright. If only one-week or 10-day extension, not a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 S: <strong>dasteton...tasiri ro nomre ina nadare ehyanan?</strong> Thank…wouldn’t it (this extra extension) likely affect my final mark?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Role Play Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 S: bashe.</td>
<td>Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 A: age be shart-e inke kar be hamoon keyfiyyati ke dar moredesh dari sohbat mikoni anjam mishe, moshkeli nist.</td>
<td>If your project is being done with the improvement you’re talking about, not a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 A: khahesh mikonam.</td>
<td>No worries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 S: man dige mozahemetoon nemisham.</td>
<td>I don’t disturb you anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 A: salamat bashin.</td>
<td>Most welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 S: kheyli lotf kardin, ba ejazatoon.</td>
<td>Appreciated. With your permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 A: Khodahafez.</td>
<td>Goodbye.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**18**

**HL**

01 *Goooyande: tagh tagh (gooyande dar mizanad).*  
Speaker: Knock knock (the speaker knocks on the door).

02 *Mokhatab: salam befarmaein.*  

03 S: *salam agha-ye doctor. Khaste nabashin.*  
Hello Professor.

04 A: *hal-e shoma chetoore? Khoob hastin?*  
How are you?

05 S: *khoobin? Ahvale shoma? Khoobin?*
Pairs | Role Play Conversations
---|---
How are you? How are you doing?

06 A: **ghorban-e shoma.**
[I’m good] Thank you.

07 S: **agha-ye doctor man valla daneshjoo shomam to in term, tooy-e dars-e ‘Mekanik Sayalat’**.
Mr Dr, I am your student in the class ‘Fluid Mechanics’ (COURSE’s NAME) in this semester.

08 A: ‘**mekanik sayalat’**?
‘Fluid Mechanics’ (COURSE’s NAME)?

09 S: **are fogh-e lisans. Bad valla eee didam in peyghameton ro ke, didam akhar-e term bayad ma biyaym poroje tahvil bedim oo. Man hala porojam ro tarif kardam valla vali moshkel in-e ke fekr nemikonam betoonam ta oon moghe tarikhi ke farmooin betoonam tahvilesb bedam. Be nazaretoon rahi dare?**
Yes, the Master’s program. Actually, err I saw your reminder that we have to turn in our project. I have worked on the outline of the project but now there is a problem that I don’t think I can submit it to you by the deadline assigned. Do you think there is a way?

10 A: **shoma sar-e kelas ha hastin ya…?**
Are you [regularly] participating in the classes or…?

11 S: **valla bazi vaghta hastim bazi vaghta nistim.**
Sometimes I sit in the classes, sometimes not.

12 A: **khob hamoon.**
Well, that’s it.

13 S: **bekhater-e inke man kar mikonam, majbooram dige bazi vaghta. Nemitoomam ham beresam.**
Because I have to go to work, I have to do [leave the classes] sometimes. I can’t do [both].

14 A: **na man kari be karetoon nadaram vali khob shoma bayad dar vaghe, man ino avval-e kelas ha kheyli vazeh vaseye daneshjooha moshakhas mikonam ke dar vaghe dar kelas bayad hozoor dashte bashin. Va ma raje be in mozo fekr mikonam ba daneshjooha chandir bar sohbat kardim va ye seri moshkelat matrah shode ke dar vaghe daneshjooha moshkeleshoon hal shode. Eee man fekr nemikonam ma**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>betoonim dar vaghe dore-ye zaman-e in poroje ro avazesh bokonim. Shoma alan moshkeleton daghighan mishe bishtar vase man tozih bedin ke moshkelet chi-ye? No, I don’t want to comment on your job but well, you must actually, I explained this to all students clearly that they have to attend the classes. And we talked about this, I think, with students several times and they talked about their problems which have been sorted out later. Err I don’t think I can extend the time for the project. Can you explain your problem more for me that what it is?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 S: valla hamoonjoor ke farmoodam, farmoodam che khabare? {labkhand} bebakshid ostad. Vali man be khater-e inke mikonam, ye khorde baze-ye zamanim mahdood-e. Hamoon kelas ham ke ehtemalan in sokhanan ro shoma farmoodid man natoonestam sar-e kelas basham. As I said before, I said, what’s up? {smile} Excuse me, professor. Because I have to go to work, I have a bit of a time limitation. Probably I was not present at the class that you talked about such stuff, to speak with you about our problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A: dorost-e Right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 S: bara hamin ye khorde zamanbandim ye khorde zaieif-e to in term va nemitoonam ye khorde karaei ke farmoodin beresam. Hamin ke betoonam darso pas konam kheyli baram bas-e. Vali nemidoonam hala hich rahi hast ke man ba daneshjoohay-e dige baham poroje erae bedim ya masalan ye rahkari ke man betoonam? For that reason, I am not good at time management in this semester and can’t spend enough time on the project. It’s enough for me that I pass this course which is very important for me. But I don’t know if is there any way that I can do a group project with other students or for example, [is there] any other alternative that I can?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 A: poroje ha, poroje ha be soorat-e fardi hast. Oon, oon halat ke emkan nadare. Alan mozei ke entekhab kardin taghriban chi-ye? Mitoonin be man tozih bedin ke...? The projects are presented individually. Group-work, it’d not be possible. What’s the topic of your project? Can you explain it to me that…?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 S: valla ma dar mored-e sayalat-e. Yani sohbati ke hala man ba bacheha kardamo ina, nazaram in-e ke khodam man roo ghesmati kar konam ke rooy-e sayalat-e tooy-e loolehay-e naftii, hala biyaym too harekateshono, vakonesheshoon be looleha age khordegi dashe bashe chejoori vakonesh neshoon mide. Mikhaym ro oon kar konim. Mozoe jadidi-ye. Didam to san’at ham estefade mishe vali khob hala nemidoonam age moshkele-e vaqhtam, be khosos in ye poroje sangin-e faghat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actually, my project is about ‘Fluid’. It means with the discussion that I had with my classmates, my idea is that I myself work on this part of Fluid in the movement of oil channels and also their reaction if they are faulty. I’d like to work on that. This is a new topic and I noticed that it’s practical in the industrial market, but I don’t know if the time limitation lets me [work on it], especially this project is just a bit dense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20    | **A:** *shoma agha-ye bebabkhshid?*  
You, Mr excuse me? |
| 21    | **S:** ‘*FAMIL’ hastam.*  
I am ‘FAMILY NAME’.* |
| 22    | **A:** ‘*FAMIL’ karet dar che zaminei-ye?*  
‘FAMILY NAME’, what’s your job about? |
| 23    | **S:** *valla kar-e man too sherkat-e naftam va karam hamin marboot...*  
I am working for an oil company and my job is on... |
| 24    | **A:** *pas kar-e mortabet dari anjam midi.*  
So your work is relevant to your study. |
| 25    | **S:** *bale, bale.*  
Yes, yes. |
| 26    | **A:** {{makes}} *valla ma mamoolan, man ye hamchin revalio ghabool nemikonam vali ba tavajoh be inke khob, mibinam kari ke darin mikin arzeshesho shayad dashte bashe. Va khob dari kar-e mortabet ham anjam midi. Shayad betoonam ye {makes} dar vaghe mozo ro ye kami bara shoma tashilesh konim.*  
{{pause}} Actually, I don’t generally accept such reasons/requests, but with regard to your job relevant to your study well, I see it might be worthy. And because you’re working on a relevant topic. Perhaps I can {{pause}} actually facilitate this issue [submitting the project] for you. |
| 27    | **S:** *dastetoon dard nakone.*  
Appreciate it. |
| 28    | **A:** *monteha eee kari ke anjam midim in-e ke shoma to hamoon dar vaghe baze-ke alan forsat dari, harchehghadresho mitooni anjam bede.*  
However, err the thing we will do is to work on the project within the limited period in fact, whatever you can do.* |
| 29 | S: *chashm.*  
Okay. |
|----|------------------|
| 30 | A: *bad baham dobare ye jalese-ei khahim dasht.*  
Then we will have another meeting. |
| 31 | S: *are*  
Yes |
| 32 | A: *man inja yad dasht mikonam.*  
I am making a note here. |
| 33 | S: *ishala poroje fogh-e lisansamam ba khodetoon migiramo ishala baham ro hamin poroje bastesh midim.*  
I hope I can work on my MA thesis under your supervision and we can develop this project together. |
You’re kind. You’re honourable. I hope we can work together. Let me see the result of this project. Let’s see how it’s going. |
{labkhand}  
Thanks, I hope so. The result is good. My activities are good doctor. You will be satisfied. {smile} |
| 36 | A: *inshala. Inshala haminjoori bashe.*  
I hope. I hope it’ll go well. |
| 37 | S: *marsi.*  
Thanks. |
| 38 | A: *bad dar jalese-ye ayanedi ke hala miyay bebinim ke cheghadr pishraft dashti va...*  
In the next meeting, we’ll see how much progress you’ve made and… |
| 39 | S: *hatman.*  
Sure. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Role Play Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 40    | A: *bad baham ye goftogoi mikonim ke bebinim ghabel-e dar vaghe err edame dadan hast ya na inke hamoonja bayad ghatesh konim.*  
Then we would discuss it to see [if] err it’d be possible to keep working on it or we have to give up there. |
| 41    | S: *chashm. Chashm.*  
Okay. Okay. |
| 42    | A: *ishala moafagh bashin.*  
Best of luck to you. |
| 43    | S: *dasteton dard nakone.*  
Thank you very much. |
| 44    | A: *khahesh mikonam.*  
No worries. |
| 45    | S: *mersi vaghteton ro dadain.*  
Thank you for your time. |
| 46    | A: *moafaghe bashin.*  
Good luck. |
| 47    | S: *ghorbooneton.*  
Sincerely yours. |
| 48    | A: *ghorbanat.*  
Sincerely yours. |
| 49    | S: *Khodahafez.*  
Goodbye. |
| 50    | A: *Khodahafez.*  
Goodbye. |
Appendix G: Stimulated Recall Interview Questions in both Persian and English

1. Do you usually use this kind of request in similar contexts? If you want to request this item again, what else could you have said?
   - Please...
   - May I?...
   - I wondered if it would be at all possible...
   - Would it be possible to do a favour?...
   - Could/can you please?...

2. In this prompt, what factor is the most important one for you?
   Addressee’s age, educational background, personality, warm welcoming, his social status, distant/close relationship with the addressee, the size or the kind of the request

3. Do you usually prepare conversation beforehand? If so, in what situation?

4. What is a good tone of voice in this prompt you have requested? Low pitch or high pitch?
Appendix H: A Portion of Transcribed Interview

Speaker

First question: Do you usually use this kind of request in similar contexts? If you want to request this item again, what else could you have said?

Answer: Yes, I do. Because he’s right virtually. And the deadline he set up has been passed. And it is not like that I want to get my right or use crude language, or serious tone of voice. I should have given my project at the due time based on the course schedule. Now I’m gonna get an extra bonus (i.e., get an extension) so I must request him to do. It’s his choice to accept or reject it. If he doesn’t accept it, I can’t yet change my tone of voice or say something else. I’m just requesting him to do me a favour [which he] gives more time now. Because of that my tone will be like that. I never use those request strategies which come with the combination ‘bothering/trouble’ (i.e., if no trouble,…Or do this trouble..) because the professor does nothing practically. We only want him to give more time’. ‘Can I request you’ is more common.

Gooyande

Soal-e avval: aya dar mavared-e moshabeh shoma az hamin noo ravesbary-e darkhast estefade mikonid? Age mikhastid taghir bedaadid ya dobare darkhasti bekonid, be che soorat darkhast mikardid?

جواب: منم همين لحنو ممکنه داشته باشم ولی اگه احساس کنم طرف خيلی ديگه داره جيز ميباره اصلا پيشش نميرم يعني ممکنه پروزه رو انجام ندم. منظور اينه كه ديگه خواهش اضافه نميکنم. بگه نه ميام برون. ميشه خواهش كنم.

Addressee

First question: Do you usually use this kind of request in similar contexts? If you want to request this item again, what else could you have said?

Answer: I might use the same tone (i.e., the same strategy) too, but if I feel my interlocutor makes excuses, I won’t never go to ask him. It means I might not do the project. I mean if he says no, I don’t make an extra request and come out. I use ‘Can I request?’
Appendix I: Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Questionnaire in Persian Using Ganji’s
(1384/2005) Translations

پرسشنامه عزت نفس

شماره شرکت کننده:..................

گوینده مخاطب

کلیه اطلاعات این پرسشنامه محرمانه تلقی و محفوظ خواهد ماند. پس لطفا نام خود را در این صفحه ذکر نفرمایید. پیشانی از مشارکت شما در این پروژه قدردانی می شود.

- سن: ..........
- شهر (در کدام شهر ایران زادگو شده اید): ...................................
- مقطع تحصیلی: دانشجوی کارشناسی ارشد دانشجوی دکتری رشته تحصیلی: ........................................

* برای پاسخ به این های عزت نفس فضای علمی دانشگاهی را در نظر بگیرید.

** نظر خود را برای هر یک از موارد ذیل با علامت (✓) نشان دهید.

---

13 This reference was published in Iran using the Iranian calendar. The researcher has mapped the Iranian calendar year to the Gregorian calendar year.
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

At times I think I am no good at all.

I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

I am able to do things as well as most other people.

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

I certainly feel useless at times.

I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

I wish I could have more respect for myself.

All in all, I am inclined to feel I am a failure.

I take a positive attitude towards myself.
Appendix J: Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Questionnaire in English

Self-esteem Questionnaire

Participants’ number ............
Speaker ☐ Addressee ☐

Thank you for participating in this project. All information will be kept anonymously, so please do not write your name on this page.

Age: .................
Degree you are currently pursuing:
MA student ☐ MS student ☐ PhD student ☐
Major: .....................................................
City (where you grew up): ..........................................................

*Please consider the self-esteem items in an academic setting.

** Tick (✓) one answer for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel I am a failure.

10. I take a positive attitude towards myself.
## Appendix K: Scale of Grading Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2- At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5- I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6- I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane/basis with others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*8- I wish I could have more respect for myself</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*9- All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>