

Elisavet Mavromati¹
University of Thessaly
Evgenia Vassilaki²
University of Thessaly

REQUESTS IN ACADEMIC SETTINGS: QUESTIONING HEARER'S ABILITY

The study explores Greek undergraduate students' (N=378) oral request patterns, referring to the Hearer's ability to act in relation to the social parameters of the interaction which might affect their choice. Previous research on requests in academic settings has primarily focused on written interactions, mainly via emails, among students and faculty members or on single aspects of everyday academic life. Data were elicited via a specifically designed Discourse Completion Task (DCT) including ten everyday situations of variant degree of imposition among students, faculty members and administrative staff. The *Could you /Can you VP explicit V-2nd person plural. Interrogatives*, among seven patterns, were found to guarantee students' politeness in the university. The factor of imposition, rated by students, was found to be affected by the addressee, the location of university and the year of study. The addressee emerged as the most crucial factor that affects students' choice of the request pattern.

Keywords: Greek, perspective, politeness, requests, university

1. INTRODUCTION

In Brown and Levinson's politeness theory model (1987), requests are considered as typical face threatening acts (FTAs), which principally threaten the addressee's negative face want and possibly threaten both participants' face. In everyday interactions, participants are mutually interested in maintaining each other's face, i.e., the public self-image that every member of a society wants to claim for herself; therefore, they employ politeness strategies to minimize the threat. Academic contexts provide for a variety of interactional situations among

¹ elsa.mavromati@gmail.com

² evasilaki@uth.gr

students, faculty members and administrative staff, which put various demands on interactants in terms of politeness requirements and manipulation of imposition in request performance. Although single aspects of everyday academic life have been included in Discourse Completion Task (DCT) instruments -such as the well-known ‘extension scenario’ (e.g., Bella 2012; Woodfield & Economidou-Kogetsidis 2010), research on request performance in these settings has been predominantly conducted in the framework of interlanguage pragmatics and/or has primarily focused on written interactions among university students and faculty members (Bella 2021; Bella & Sifianou 2012; Biesenbach-Lucas 2007; Chen 2006; Farhang-Ju 2020; Savić 2018). Researchers explore request performance and students’ and/or lecturers’ perceptions on it, by examining address forms (Bella & Sifianou 2012; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2018), level of directness, the employed strategies (Bella 2012; Biesenbach-Lucas 2007; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011; Hermanová 2018; Phaisarnsittthikarn 2020), substrategies (Lin 2009), internal and external modification devices (Economidou-Kogetsidis 2009, 2008), request perspective (Economidou-Kogetsidis 2012), as well as the development of requestive performance (Bella 2012; Halenko & Winder 2021). Research findings highlight students’ infelicities in the appropriate use of the request elements mentioned above, as well as in the estimation of related context factors. Hence, request production in academic settings, both in L2 and in L1, has been considered as highly demanding regarding the level of sociopragmatic competence, which, as Kasper and Rose explain (2001: 2) “relates to the social perceptions underlying participants’ interpretation and performance of communicative action”. However, research on oral request performance in a wider range of interactional situations that may arise in academic contexts is rather scarce (e.g., Dong 2009; Economidou-Kogetsidis & Halenko 2022; Lin 2009).

Against this backdrop, the present study is set to explore oral request production of undergraduate students in the context of Greek universities. More specifically, it investigates the distribution of use of request patterns according to three variables associated with the degree of request imposition, i.e., to the addressee (faculty member vs. member of administrative staff), to the location of the institution (central vs. regional universities), and to the year of study of student participants (first vs. final year of study). The study draws on data from a wider doctoral research project on the production and the perception of students’ oral requests in the Greek academic setting.

1.1. Requests in the Greek academic setting

Some evidence on students’ oral requestive behaviour in the Greek academic setting comes from interlanguage pragmatics studies on Greek FL students’ request performance (Bella 2012; Μπέλλα 2013; 2011). Greek L1

university students' or graduates' requests are included in these studies as baseline data. When performing requests to faculty members in academic life situations, i.e., the extension situation, Greek L1 students prefer conventionally indirect strategies, most frequently the speaker-oriented permission strategy. As Bella (2012: 1941) remarks, "This can easily be interpreted if one alludes to the power difference and the high imposition that are inherent in this particular situation, rendering it ideal for the use of the Permission strategy".

In a recent cross-sectional study comparing Greek L1 and L2 students' written communication with faculty members via email, Bella (2021) finds formality to be a consistent feature, which indicates that students acknowledge hierarchy and distance. She also notes that Greek students exploit their native competence to have "greater access to rather complex linguistic devices like hinting, passivisation, manipulation of request perspective and formulaic expressions as well as to their combinations" (2021: 223), in order to express their requests and achieve compliance. Although query preparatory structures were used more frequently in L2 students' production, a difference of perspective was observed in the way they were employed across Greek L1 and L2 students. Query preparatories "in the L1S data were, as a rule (9/10), phrased as impersonal" (2021: 215).

With a focus on Greek as L1 solely, Bella & Sifianou (2012) explored student e-mail requests to faculty members at the University of Athens. Formality, directed at both addressee' and students' face wants protection, was the single feature found to characterise all the e-mails considered. The level of it appears to be determined by students' perception of the weight of the request imposition, which is in turn related to the students' perceptions of "their right to perform it [the request] and the teacher's obligation to grant it" (2012: 92).

To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first that focuses on oral request production in Greek as L1, in a variety of interactional situations among students, faculty members and administrative staff, in the Greek academic setting of both central and regional universities. More specifically, in the paper we present and discuss results on ability structures, i.e., patterns realised by various forms of the verb *μπορώ* (=can) or verbal expressions denoting ability, which were found as the most frequent choices in our data (71% of the total request utterances analysed). We further attempt to investigate the distribution of these structures, as well as the degree of their conventionalization in the expression of requests in the Greek academic setting, with respect to three variables which relate to the social parameters of the interaction, i.e., the addressee, the location of the university and the students' year of study, as well as to the estimated degree of imposition. The location of the university, whether central or regional, is included as a variable on the assumption that it might have an effect on the degree of familiarity and/or the power relations among interactants. We hypothesize that

in regional universities, the more frequent and closer contact among students and faculty members or administrative staff could lead to looser power relations and to a higher degree of familiarity. As Cox (2011: 61) affirms, after having been involved in several studies related to faculty-student interactions, “Even simple, incidental contacts mean something to students”. Furthermore, we examined the variable of year of study, in order to compare students’ requestive behaviour in the beginning and at the end of their academic experience.

In the context outlined, the research questions of the study are framed as follows:

RQ1: What is the effect of the social parameters of the interaction on the subjective request imposition in ability structures requests?

RQ2: What is the distribution of ability structures in terms of frequency of use?

RQ3: What is the effect of the addressee, the location of university, the year of study and the request imposition on students’ choice of each pattern?

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants

A total of 378 undergraduate students participated in the study. Data collection involved 4 groups of students, as presented in table 1. Students were recruited on a voluntary basis from the University of Athens, the National Technical University of Athens, the Athens University of Economics & Business and Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (central institutions) as well as the University of Thessaly in the cities of Lamia and Volos (regional).

	1st year students	final (4th+) students
central university	93	92
regional university	102	91

Table 1. Participants

2.2. Data Collection

Three thousand seven hundred and eighty (3780) request utterances were elicited via a specifically designed Discourse Completion Task (DCT), which included ten everyday situations of variant degree of imposition in the academic context. Five situations were designed to elicit requests addressed to faculty members and five situations to administrative staff. Two more situations were designed to function as distractors.

The use of the DCT was ideally contributing to our research questions, due to the effective control of the situational variables and the administrative advantages that the instrument provides, as opposed to naturalistic interaction (Ogiermann 2018: 229; Taguchi 2012: 59).

Furthermore, the degree of imposition of the request items was estimated by participants via an imposition assessment questionnaire. Students were asked to rate the weight of imposition of each request on a 5-point quantitatively described scale (from 'not at all' to 'very much').

2.3. Data Classification

Request utterances were codified after the classification schema of Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), which was further modified for level of transparency of the requested actions (explicit vs. implicit requests e.g., *Can you give me the X certificate?* vs. *Can you help me?*) and elaborated in order to accommodate language-specific patterns (see also Bella 2012; Biesenbach-Lucas 2007; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011; Phaisarnsitthikarn 2020; Sifianou 1992; Trosborg 1995).

Statistical analysis of the data was carried out using the SPSS 25 version in order to identify the more frequently recurring structures. Out of the 3780 requests in our data, 2685 (71%) were formulated by an ability structure under the conventionally indirect strategy of the query preparatory, which mostly refers to the Hearer's ability to perform the requested action (e.g., *Μπορείτε να μου δείξετε το γραπτό μου;* [Can you show me my test?]). However, we observed that speakers often tended to further exploit an interplay between the impersonal and the inclusive request perspective (e.g., *Γίνεται να δούμε το γραπτό μου;* [Is it possible for us to have a look at my test?]), and/or the level of transparency of the request (e.g., *Γίνεται να κάνουμε κάτι;* [Is it possible for us we do something?]).

Hence, we further coded request utterances according to four coding categories within the Head Act, in order to search for all possible combinations within ability structures. The 4 coding categories were as follows:

1. ability expression
 - [can I/can we (*μπορώ/μπορούμε να*). interrogative]
 - [can you (*μπορείτε να*). interrogative]
 - [is it possible (e.g., *γίνεται να*). interrogative]
2. level of transparency (explicit/implicit)
3. perspective (speaker oriented/inclusive/hearer oriented/impersonal)
4. (\pm) conditional

3. RESULTS

3.1. Imposition in ability structures (1st research question)

Imposition of ability structure requests, as rated by students, was examined by 3-way ANOVA test, with respect to the three independent variables: the addressee of the request, the location of university and the year of study. Students’ rating of imposition was found affected by all three variables.

More specifically, imposition was found higher to faculty members than to administrative staff [F(1, 2637)=12.820 p<.001], higher in central than in regional universities [F(1, 2637)=13.878, p<.001] higher in students of 4th and plus year of study than in 1st year students [F(1, 2637)=24.975, p<.001]

3.2. Patterns of ability structures (2nd research question)

Combinations of codes of the four coding categories within the Head Act (ability structures, level of transparency, perspective, conditional) indicated that 1600 (59.6%) of the ability requests were classified into 7 specific patterns (with 100 or more request utterances in each) (Table 2).

P1	<p>[Could you+ VP / explicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative]</p> <p>Με συγχωρείτε για την ενόχληση, αλλά επειδή δεν μπόρεσα να έρθω εχθές (ενν. στο γραφείο σας), μήπως θα μπορούσατε να μου δείξετε το γραπτό μου σήμερα;</p> <p>I apologize for bothering, but since I couldn’t come yesterday (i.e., to your office), could you show me my test today?</p>	26.13%
P2	<p>[Can you+ VP / explicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative]</p> <p>Συγγνώμη, μήπως μπορείτε να μιλάτε πιο δυνατά, γιατί εδώ δεν ακούμε;</p> <p>Excuse me, can you maybe speak louder, because we can’t hear you over here?</p>	22.69%
P3	<p>[Can you+ VP / implicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative]</p> <p>Μπορείτε να το ξαναπείτε;</p> <p>Can you repeat it?</p>	15.75%
P4	<p>[Could you+ VP / implicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative]</p> <p>Χίλια συγγνώμη που έρχομαι αυτή την ώρα, μήπως θα μπορούσατε να με εξυπηρετήσετε;</p> <p>I am terribly sorry to come at this hour, but could you possibly help me?</p>	11.31%

P5	[Could I/Could we + VP / explicit V-1st person singular. interrogative] <i>Συγγνώμη αλλά θα μπορούσα να δω το γραπτό μου σήμερα γιατί τη μέρα που είχε οριστεί είχα μια υποχρέωση;</i> Excuse me but, could I have a look at my test today because the day appointed I had a commitment?	8.69%
P6	[3 rd person verb/impersonal VP explicit V - 2nd person plural. interrogative] <i>Είναι εύκολο να μου δείξετε σήμερα το γραπτό μου;</i> Is it easy for you to show me my test today?	9.06%
P7	[3 rd person verb/impersonal VP explicit V - 1st person singular. interrogative] <i>Συγγνώμη για την ώρα αλλά επειδή επείγει μήπως γίνεται να έχω το τάδε πιστοποιητικό;</i> I apologise for the (late) hour but, since it is urgent, is it maybe possible for me to have this type of certificate?	6.38%

Table 2. Patterns of ability structures

3.3. Choice of request pattern & variables (3rd research question)

In order to examine the effect of the four variables (addressee, university location, year of study, and imposition) on students' choice of request pattern, we used binary logistic regression with dependent variable the choice of a specific pattern or not.

	Patterns	Addressee	Location of University	Year of Study	Imposition
P1	[Could you + VP / explicit V- 2 nd p. pl. interr.]	administrative staff			lower
P2	[Can you+ VP / explicit V- 2 nd p. pl. interr.]	administrative staff		1 st year	lower
P3	[Can you+ VP / implicit V- 2 nd p. pl. interr.]	administrative staff			

P4	[Could you+ VP / implicit V- 2 nd p. pl. interr.]	administrative staff		1 st year	
P5	[Could I/Could we + VP / explicit V-1st p. sing. interr.]	faculty members			
P6	[3 rd person verb/ impersonal VP explicit V - 2nd p. pl. interr.]	administrative staff			
P7	[3 rd person verb/ impersonal VP explicit V - 1st p. sing. interr.]	faculty members			

Table 3. Choice of request pattern & variables

As presented in Table 3, regarding the choice of pattern, results indicate that students will more probably choose:

- the pattern 1 (P1) [Could you (Θα μπορούσατε να) + VP explicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative] in order to address a lower imposition request [(B=-.119, p=.010), probability: 1.13 times for a unit], to administrative staff [(B=-.756, p<.001), probability: 2.13 times higher] rather than to a faculty member
- the pattern 2 (P2) [Can you (Μπορείτε να) + VP explicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative] in their first year of studies compared to those in their fourth year [(B=.301, p=.010) probability: 1.35 times higher], in order to address a lower, in their view, imposition request [(B=-.289, p<.001), probability: 1.33 times for a unit] to administrative staff rather than to a faculty member [(B=-.267, p=.021), probability: 1.31 times higher]
- the pattern 4 (P4) [Could you (Θα μπορούσατε να) + VP implicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative] in their first year of studies compared to those in their fourth year [(B=.344, p=.029) probability: 1.4 times higher], in order to address a request to administrative staff rather than to a faculty member [(B=-.431, p=.006), probability: 1.5 times higher]
- the pattern 5 (P5) [Could I/Could we (Θα μπορούσα /Θα μπορούσαμε να) + VP explicit V-1st person singular. interrogative] (probability: 1.7 times higher) and also the pattern 7 (P7) [3rd person verb/impersonal VP + explicit V-1st person singular. interrogative] (probability: 3.4 times higher), in order to address a request to a faculty member compared to administrative staff

- the pattern 3 (P3) [Can you (*Μπορείτε να*) + VP implicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative] (probability: 1.9 times higher) and also the pattern 6 (P6) [3rd person verb/impersonal VP +explicit V- 2nd person plural. interrogative] (probability: 2.2 times higher) in order to address a request to administrative staff compared to a faculty member.

4. DISCUSSION

In Brown and Levinson's politeness theory model, the assessment of the seriousness of a 'face threatening act' involves three social variables: the social distance (D), the relative power (P) between participants and the absolute ranking of imposition (R) in each particular culture. The weight of imposition can be calculated based on them (1987: 61–76). In the context of our study, quite unsurprisingly, imposition -as rated by students- was found higher for requests addressed to faculty members than to administrative staff, in central than in regional universities, by final year students than by 1st year students. These results further affirm the well-established institutional roles in the Greek university context (Bella & Sifianou 2012). They also confirm our initial assumptions that social distance is rather high in central universities and that students' perception of the social parameters of the interaction increases as they reach towards the end of their experience in the academic context.

The overarching preference of ability patterns in request formulation in our data accords with the attested 'formality' of the Greek university context (Bella 2021; Bella & Sifianou 2012; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011; Hirschon 2001; Koutsantoni 2005; Sifianou 2013). Formality was further conveyed by the use of an array of linguistic devices such as the formal second person plural (V-form), the conditional modal (*θα μπορούσατε να*), 3rd person verb/impersonal VP structures (e.g., *Γίνεται να*), the lack of transparency, i.e. vagueness, of the requested action (implicit requests) and the shift in perspective.

More specifically, it seems that the most preferred patterns [[Could you]/[Can you] VP explicit V- 2nd person plural. Interrogative structure]] guarantee students the expression of politeness in the university context in line with the conventional use of the modal verb *μπορώ* (can) in Greek "to introduce requests, especially when there is lack of familiarity" and of the more formal conditional form *θα μπορούσα* (could) when "there are status differences" (Sifianou 1992: 144). The widespread use of these patterns renders them as 'default', 'play-safe' request strategies in formal contexts, e.g.

[student's requests to a faculty member]

- (1) *Με συγχωρείτε για την ενόχληση, αλλά επειδή δεν μπόρεσα να έρθω
εχθές (ενν. στο γραφείο σας), μήπως θα μπορούσατε να μου δείξετε*

το γραπτό μου σήμερα;

I apologize for bothering, but since I couldn't come yesterday (i.e., to your office), **could you show me my test today?**

- (2) Συγγνώμη, **μήπως μπορείτε να μιλάτε πιο δυνατά**, γιατί εδώ δεν ακούμε;

Excuse me, **can you maybe speak louder**, because we can't hear you over here?

[student's request to administrative staff]

- (3) Συγγνώμη, **θα μπορούσατε να μου δώσετε ένα πιστοποιητικό σπουδών** γιατί είναι επείγον και το χρειάζομαι;

Excuse me, **could you give me a certificate** because it is urgent and I need it?

- (4) Συγγνώμη **μπορείτε να μου δώσετε ένα πιστοποιητικό σπουδών;**

Excuse me, **can you give me a certificate?**

The 'default' status of these two patterns might also explain the higher probability for first year students to choose them when they address their requests to administrative staff. As young adults, who lack academic context experience, but want to preserve their face, students express themselves using the minimum amount of linguistic elements that guarantee them the required formality, choosing the verb *μπορώ* (can) and an explicit verb for the requested action (example 4). When they opt for the more formal conditional modal *θα μπορούσατε* (could you), they couple it with a verb of implicit reference (example 5), which functions more like a formula and may 'sound like' the way an educated adult is supposed to behave towards administration.

- (5) Χίλια συγγνώμη που έρχομαι αυτή την ώρα, **μήπως θα μπορούσατε να με εξυπηρετήσετε;**

I am terribly sorry to come at this hour, but could you possibly help me?

When students address faculty members, however, they tend to manipulate the politeness demands of the situation by making use of other linguistic devices in order to negotiate politeness demands, e.g., an interplay of perspective between the main verb and the VP-complement, see example (6):

- (6) Καλησπέρα, **είναι μήπως δυνατόν σήμερα να μπορέσω να δω το γραπτό μου;**

Good afternoon, **is it perhaps possible for me to be able to have a look at my test?**

At first sight, it can be argued that by shifting the perspective from the more formal impersonal to the speaker's perspective, students increase the level of negative politeness and avoid imposition, since "avoidance to name the hearer as actor can reduce the form's level of coerciveness" (Blum-Kulka 1989: 59). Thus, they show the required respect to their teachers (see example 6). However, we argue that shifting the perspective towards the speaker's could also be interpreted as an element, which points to positive politeness. By framing students as the agents of the action, it projects them as equal participants in the relationship with their educators. In other words, it could indicate that students seem to become orientated to sharing in-group relationships in the context of their everyday interactions with faculty members, which does not necessarily contradict formality and deference. Besides, as Koutsantoni (2004: 136) notes, "Status, [...] does not preclude solidarity in vertical societies, such as the Greek" and "Greek students may acknowledge the fact that their lecturers are of higher status but this does not prevent them from stressing the solidarity between them".

When students address their request to the administrative staff, they exploit the interplay between the formal impersonal perspective again, and, interestingly, the hearer-oriented perspective, i.e., the most common request perspective choice in Greek, in a symmetrical non formal academic situations (Ogiermann & Bella 2020). Hence, this choice, at first sight, could possibly point to familiarity. We argue that it could also indicate formality, distance, and distinct roles, in the sense that students separate themselves from administrative procedures while they feel closer to sharing academic interests.

(7) *Συγγνώμη για την ενόχληση, αλλά μήπως γίνεται να μου δώσετε τώρα το πιστοποιητικό;*

I apologize for bothering, but **is it perhaps possible for you to give me the certificate now?**

Formality and distance, or rather, distancing, may also account for the students' preference to express low imposition requests to administrative staff by utterances introduced with the verb *μπορώ* (can) and implicit reference to the administrative action:

(8) *Σας παρακαλώ, μπορείτε να με εξυπηρετήσετε;*

Can you please help me?

In sum, the distribution of patterns in the dataset seems to point to a perception of politeness as more context-bounded and dynamic with students negotiating the traditionally assumed power hierarchies in the academy.

5. CONCLUSION

In the present study, we explored ability structures in ungraduated students' requests addressed to faculty members and to administrative staff in the Greek academic setting. In line with previous research results, we found that students exploit formality to show the required respect to their teachers and also to present themselves as educated adults protecting both the addressee's negative face and their own positive face wants (Bella & Sifianou 2012). The variable of students' rating of imposition was found affected by the variables of the addressee, the location of the university and the year of study. However, the addressee emerged as the most crucial parameter in directing students' linguistic choices at least, with respect to ability structures, when all factors were examined in interaction. This finding may point to the well-established institutional roles in the Greek university context.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank Professor Jasmin-Olga Sarafidou who contributed to statistical analyses.

References

- Bella 2021: S. Bella, In search of the missing grade. Egalitarianism and deference in L1 and L2 students' emails to faculty members. In M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. Savić & N. Halenko (eds.), *Email Pragmatics and Second Language Learners* (pp. 203–226). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bella 2012: S. Bella, Pragmatic development in a foreign language: A study of Greek FL requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44, 1917–1947.
- Bella & Sifianou 2012: S. Bella, M. Sifianou, Greek Student E-mail Requests to Faculty Members. In L. R. de Zarobe & Y. R. de Zarobe (eds.), *Speech Acts and Politeness across Languages and Cultures* (pp. 89–113). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Biesenbach-Lucas 2007: S. Biesenbach-Lucas, Students Writing E-mails to Faculty: an Examination of E-politeness among Native and Non-native Speakers of English. *Language Learning & Technology* 11(2), 59–81.
- Blum-Kulka 1989: S. Blum-Kulka, Playing it Safe: The Role of Conventionality in Indirectness. In: S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp. 37–70). New Jersey: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper 1989: S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, G. Kasper, Investigating Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: An Introductory Overview. In S. Blum-Kulka,

- J. House & G. Kasper (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies* (pp.1–34). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Brown & Levinson 1987: P. Brown, S. C Levinson, *Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen 2006: C.-F. E. Chen, The Development of E-mail Literacy: From Writing to Peers to Writing to Authority Figures. *Language Learning & Technology*, 10(2), 35–55.
- Cox 2011: B. E. Cox, A Developmental Typology of Faculty-Student Interaction Outside the Classroom. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2011(S1), 49–66.
- Dong 2009: X. Dong, *Requests in Academic Settings in English, Russian and Chinese*. [PhD Thesis]. Ohio: Ohio State University, [Online], [https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_etd/send_file/send?accession=osu1245463927&disposition=attachment].
- Economidou-Kogetsidis & Halenko 2022: M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, N. Halenko, Developing spoken requests during UK study abroad: A longitudinal look at Japanese learners of English. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education* 7 (1), 23–53.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis 2018: M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, “Mr Paul, please inform me accordingly” Address forms, directness and degree of imposition in L2 emails. *Pragmatics* 28 (4), 489–516.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis 2012: M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, Modifying oral requests in a foreign language. The case of Greek Cypriot learners of English. In: M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, & H. Woodfield (eds.), *Interlanguage Request Modification* (pp. 163–201). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011: M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, “Please answer me as soon as possible”: Pragmatic failure in non-native speakers’ e-mail requests to faculty. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (13), 3193–3215.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis 2009: M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, Interlanguage request modification: The use of lexical/phrasal downgraders and mitigating supportive moves. *Multilingua* 28, 79–112.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis 2008: M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, Internal and external mitigation in interlanguage request production: The case of Greek learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4, 111–138.
- Farhang-Ju 2020: M. Farhang-Ju, A Window to L2 Learners’ Requests to Faculty in Instant Text-Based Communication. *CALL-EJ*, 21(1), 29–41.
- Halenko & Winder 2021: N. Halenko, L. Winder, Experts and novices: examining academic email requests to faculty and developmental change during study abroad. In M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. Savić & N. Halenko (eds.), *Email*

- Pragmatics and Second Language Learners* (pp. 101–128). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hermanová 2018: A. Hermanová, *Politeness Strategies in Foreign Students' Written Requests*. [Master thesis]. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, [Online], [<https://dspace.cuni.cz/handle/20.500.11956/95318>].
- Hirschon 2001: R. Hirschon, Freedom, solidarity and obligation: The socio-cultural context of Greek politeness. In A. Bayraktaroğlu & M. Sifianou (eds.), *Linguistic Politeness Across Boundaries. The case of Greek and Turkish* (pp. 17–42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kasper & Rose 2001: G. Kasper, K. R. Rose, Pragmatics in language teaching. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 1–9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koutsantoni 2005: D. Koutsantoni, Greek Cultural Characteristics and Academic Writing. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 23, 97–138.
- Koutsantoni 2004: D. Koutsantoni, Relations of power and solidarity in scientific communities: A cross-cultural comparison of politeness strategies in the writing of native English speaking and Greek engineers. *Multilingua* 23, 111–143.
- Lin, 2009: Y.-H. Lin, Query preparatory modals: Cross-linguistic and cross-situational variations in request modification. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1636–1656.
- Μπέλλα 2013: Σ. Μπέλλα, Καθάρισε αμέσως την κουζίνα παρακαλώ!: Αιτήματα μαθητών της Ελληνικής ως ξένης γλώσσας. In N. Lavidas, T. Alexiou, A.M. Sougari (eds.), *Major Trends in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics 3: Selected Papers from the 20th ISTAL* (pp. 267–283). London: Versita.
- Μπέλλα 2011: Σ. Μπέλλα, Διατύπωση αιτημάτων: Διαφορές μεταξύ φυσικών και μη φυσικών ομιλητών της Ελληνικής. In P. Δελβερούδη, Μ. Παπαδάκη, Μ.-Χ. Αναστασιάδη & Μ. Πατέλη (επιμ.), *Διασταυρώσεις. Μελέτες στη διδακτική των ξένων γλωσσών και πολιτισμών, τη γλωσσολογία και τη μετάφραση αφιερωμένες στην Πηνελόπη Καλλιαμπέτσου-Κορακά* (σσ. 275–290). Αθήνα: Ινστιτούτο του Βιβλίου–Α. Καρδαμίτσα.
- Ogiermann, 2018: E. Ogiermann, Discourse completion tasks. In A. H. Jucker, K.P. Schneider & W. Bublitz (eds.), *Methods in Pragmatics* (pp. 229–255). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Ogiermann & Bella, 2020: E. Ogiermann, S. Bella, An Interlanguage Study of Request Perspective: Evidence from German, Greek, Polish and Russian Learners of English. *Contrastive Pragmatics* 1, 180–209.
- Phaisarnsitthikarn 2020: J. Phaisarnsitthikarn, *The Development of Pragmatic Competence in Request Speech Acts of Thai Learners of English in Study Abroad Contexts*. [PhD thesis], Toronto: University of Toronto, [Online], [<http://hdl.handle.net/1807/100911>].

- Savić 2018: M. Savić, Lecturer perceptions of im/politeness and in/appropriateness in student e-mail requests: A Norwegian perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics* 124, 52–72.
- Sifianou 2013: M. Sifianou, The impact of globalisation on politeness and impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 55, 86–102.
- Sifianou 1992: M. Sifianou, *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece. A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taguchi 2012: N. Taguchi, *Context, Individual Differences and Pragmatic Competence. Second Language Acquisition: 62*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Trosborg 1995: A. Trosborg, *Interlanguage Pragmatics. Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Woodfield & Economidou-Kogetsidis 2010: H. Woodfield, M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, 'I just need more time': A study of native and non-native students'. *Multilingua*, 77–118.

Ελισάβετ Μαυρομάτη
Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλίας, Τμήμα Δημοτικής Εκπαίδευσης

Ευγενία Βασιλάκη
Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλίας, Τμήμα Δημοτικής Εκπαίδευσης

**ΤΑ ΑΙΤΗΜΑΤΑ ΣΤΟ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΑΪΚΟ ΠΕΡΙΒΑΛΛΟΝ:
ΔΙΕΡΕΥΝΩΝΤΑΣ ΤΗΝ ΙΚΑΝΟΤΗΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΚΡΟΑΤΗ**

Περίληψη

Η διατύπωση αιτημάτων στο ακαδημαϊκό περιβάλλον μελετάται κυρίως στο πλαίσιο της πραγματολογίας της διαγλώσσας στην εξέταση αιτημάτων μη φυσικών ομιλητών σε μεμονωμένες, ασύμμετρες καταστάσεις. Πρόσφατα η έρευνα εστιάζει στη γραπτή παραγωγή αιτημάτων κυρίως μέσω ηλεκτρονικών μηνυμάτων φοιτητών προς το εκπαιδευτικό προσωπικό (Bella & Sifianou 2012; Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011; Savić 2018). Η παρούσα έρευνα εστιάζει στην προφορική παραγωγή αιτημάτων προπτυχιακών φοιτητών και φοιτητριών προς το εκπαιδευτικό και διοικητικό προσωπικό. Αποτελεί μέρος ευρύτερης διδακτορικής έρευνας στην παραγωγή αιτημάτων στο ακαδημαϊκό περιβάλλον. Τα γλωσσικά δεδομένα συλλέχθηκαν μέσω ειδικά διαμορφωμένου εργαλείου συμπλήρωσης διαλόγου σε δέκα διαβαθμισμένες, ως προς την επιβάρυνση, περιστάσεις διατύπωσης αιτημάτων. Για την εκτίμηση της επιβάρυνσης σχεδιάστηκε ειδικό ερωτηματολόγιο. Τα εργαλεία απευθύνθηκαν σε 378 συνολικά φοιτητές και φοιτήτριες, πρώτου και τετάρτου έτους, κεντρικών και περιφερειακών πανεπιστημίων. Βάση για την κωδικοποίηση των γλωσσικών δεδομένων αποτέλεσε το μοντέλο των Blum-Kulka et al (1989) που προσαρμόστηκε στις δομές που προέκυψαν από τα

δεδομένα, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη μεταγενέστερα μοντέλα και παρατηρήσεις (Bella 2012, Biesenbach-Lucas 2007, Economidou-Kogetsidis 2011, Phaisarnsitthikarn 2020, Sifianou 1992, Trosborg 1995). Στην ανάλυση προστέθηκε το επίπεδο διαφάνειας του ρήματος δράσης. Εξετάστηκαν οι δομές των κύριων πράξεων με αναφορά στην ικανότητα του ακροατή. Αναζητήθηκαν φόρμουλες με βάση κατηγορίες που αφορούν την κύρια πράξη: τη δομή, την προοπτική, τη διαφάνεια και τη μη υποχρεωτική χρήση παρελθοντικού χρόνου. Βρέθηκαν επτά συχνότερες φόρμουλες, από τις οποίες οι *θα μπορούσατε/μπορείτε να + ρήμα ρητής δράσης β' πληθ. προσ.* φάνηκε ότι προτιμώνται ως οι πλέον ασφαλείς επιλογές για την κάλυψη των αναγκών της ευγένειας στον ακαδημαϊκό χώρο. Ο παράγοντας της εκτιμώμενης επιβάρυνσης βρέθηκε ότι έχει σχέση με τους άλλους τρεις της έρευνας: με τον αποδέκτη του αιτήματος, τον τόπο και το έτος φοίτησης του ομιλητή. Όταν η επιλογή κάθε φόρμουλας συσχετίστηκε και με τους τέσσερις παράγοντες μαζί, ο αποδέκτης φάνηκε καθοριστικός στην επιλογή της για τα αιτήματα με αναφορά στην ικανότητα του ακροατή.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: ελληνική, προοπτική, ευγένεια, αιτήματα, πανεπιστήμιο