

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Inga Hilbig

**LITHUANIAN AND ENGLISH LINGUISTIC POLITENESS: REQUESTS**

Summary of doctoral dissertation

Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2009

The research was carried out at Vilnius University in 2004–2009.

**Research supervisor:**

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meilutė Ramonienė  
Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H

**The dissertation will be defended before the Council of Philological Sciences of the Vilnius University.**

**Chair:**

**Prof. Dr. Ineta Dabašinskiė**  
Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H

**Members:**

**Prof. Habil. Dr. Rūta Marcinkevičienė**  
Vytautas Magnus University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H  
**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Inesa Šeškauskienė**  
Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H  
**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Loreta Vilkienė**  
Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H  
**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meilutė Ramonienė**  
Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H

**Opponents:**

**Prof. Habil. Dr. Eleonora Lassan**  
Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H  
**Prof. Dr. Giedrė Čepaitienė**  
Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H

**The defence of the dissertation will be open to the public. It is to be held at a public meeting of the Council of Philological Sciences of the Vilnius University at 11.30 a. m. on December 18, 2009 in the V. Krėvė lecture hall of the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University.**

**Address: Universiteto St. 5 LT–01513, Vilnius, Lithuania. Phone: +370 5 2687214**

The Summary of the doctoral dissertation was sent out on November 17, 2009.

The dissertation is available at the library of Vilnius University.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Inga Hilbig

**LIETUVIŲ IR ANGLŲ LINGVISTINIS MANDAGUMAS: PRAŠYMAI**

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka

Humanitariniai mokslai, Filologija (04 H)

Vilnius, 2009

Disertacija rengta 2004–2009 metais Vilniaus universitete.

**Mokslinio darbo vadovė:**

**doc. dr. Meilutė Ramonienė**

Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje.**

**Pirmininkė:**

**prof. dr. Ineta Dabašinskienė**

Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**Narės:**

**prof. habil. dr. Rūta Marcinkevičienė**

Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**doc. dr. Inesa Šeškauskienė**

Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**doc. dr. Loreta Vilkienė**

Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**doc. dr. Meilutė Ramonienė**

Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**Oponentės:**

**prof. habil. dr. Eleonora Lissan**

Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**prof. dr. Giedrė Čepaitienė**

Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H

**Disertacija bus ginama viešame Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2009 m. gruodžio mėn. 18 d. 11.30 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakulteto V. Krėvės auditorijoje.**

**Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT–01513, Vilnius, Lietuva, tel. +370 5 2687214**

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2009 m. lapkričio 17 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

## INTRODUCTION

**The novelty and relevance of the research.** Linguistic pragmatics is concerned with the study of the usage of linguistic signs in communication, the speaker's meaning, the contextual meaning, the hearer's interpretation and how more gets communicated than is said (Yule 1998). This work is part of the area of linguistic politeness which has developed into a separate sub-discipline of pragmatics.

Linguistic politeness explores the linguistic mechanisms of interpersonal relationship management in interaction. After the publication of a seminal work by Brown and Levinson (1987 [1978]), linguistic politeness experienced an explosion of interest. Over the past thirty years, many empirical studies have been carried out, examining languages from around the world, while recent years have also seen the advent of new theories re-examining traditional scientific beliefs and offering new theoretical structures.

In Lithuanian linguistics, pragmatics itself is still a relatively new scientific discipline. The major publications that were the most relevant for the research on request speech acts presented in this dissertation, are works by Čepaitienė (2007), Gudavičienė (2007) and Zaikauskas (2002). Although there quite a few ethnographic, ethnolinguistic, and sociolinguistic studies on language etiquette (e.g. Bylaitė-Lapinskienė 2004a, Gudavičius 2000, Jasiūnaitė 1997), as well as a number of popular educational works dealing with language culture issues (e.g. Kučinskaitė, 1990 [1985], 2003; Šukys 2003), the interest in politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon is only now appearing. The most significant scientific work dedicated specifically to politeness in speech acts with considerable attention devoted to requests, is the afore-mentioned study by Čepaitienė (2007).

This doctoral dissertation is the first attempt to examine spoken Lithuanian requests and their politeness in particular experimental situations. The chosen course of research is in direct opposite to those that have been used up to the present time, as the analysis starts from a function of an utterance, moving to its form. Rather than trying to cover all the possible means to formulate a request in Lithuanian, attention is focused on the actual usage of these speech acts. The aim is to determine the most frequent, the most

acceptable, and thus presumably polite, ways to request in Lithuanian in various social situations. At the same time, this is also the first study in cross-cultural pragmatics in Lithuanian linguistics, since the Lithuanian requests are compared to data on British English collected under exactly the same conditions. The author not only carries out a linguistic analysis of the speech acts in question, but also offers some socio-cultural insights into the Lithuanian cultural ethos – the politeness norms that affect the way Lithuanian requests are made and the cultural attitudes and values that determine these politeness norms.

**The object of the study.** One group of directives, requests, were chosen for this research. The reasons for this choice are the following:

- requests are very frequent and important in various daily situations;
- when making a request, the speaker imposes him or herself on the hearer to a greater or lesser extent. Hence in attempting to achieve his/her communicative goal, but not to damage the interpersonal relationship too, there is a need to put politeness strategies into action in order to mitigate the imposition;
- requests are context-sensitive and greatly vary according to socio-cultural and situational factors. The variation of their grammatical constructions, semantic formulas and frequency of the usage in different languages reflect different politeness norms in different lingua-cultural communities.
- Different realizations of requests tend to hinder cross-cultural communication and contribute to stereotypes about ‘polite’ and ‘impolite’ nations.
- requests have received much attention in linguistic politeness, especially when studied from a cross-cultural perspective, and have been widely researched in a number of languages, excluding Lithuanian, where they still deserve a better coverage.

Since what is considered to be ‘normal’ in the process of communication might in fact be linguistically and culturally specific, a decision was made to study Lithuanian requests and compare this information with language data from another country. The choice of British English was mainly determined by the fact that, just like other main varieties of English, it has been the most widely researched in terms of the politeness perspective. This served as a secure spring-board and a pillar for a study using Lithuanian data. However it should be noted that despite the fact that English has been

chosen for many other cross-cultural politeness researches, neither this nor any other language can be taken as a 'politeness standard' against which others are measured. A basic premise on which this research is carried out and which the author tries to further strengthen is that every lingua-cultural community can be polite in its own way, and the aim of contrastive studies are to discover these special aspects and attempt to explain them. In this work, the main focus is concentrated on Lithuanian requests.

**The aim of the dissertation** is to define politeness strategies and their realizations in Lithuanian and English requests elicited in identical experimental situations, taking social and situational contextual variables into account; to identify and explain the similarities and differences between Lithuanian and English requests, the frequency and conventionality of various request head acts, and their supplementary components. To achieve these goals, the following research **tasks** were set:

1. To carry out an analysis of request strategies and sub-strategies (request models determined by the level of the directness of an utterance); to analyze the influence of the main contextual variables (social distance, social power and size of the request) on the choice of request strategies.
2. To explore requests' internal syntactical and morphological as well as lexical and phrasal modifiers (additional elements within a head act).
3. To investigate requests' external modifiers (additional semantic components appearing in the closest linguistic context of a head act, which constitute a request sequence).
4. To try to explain the discovered differences by the cultural inclination of the Lithuanians and the English towards different politeness types: respectively positive (showing closeness and solidarity), and negative (marking distance and expressing deference) (Brown, Levinson 1987).

**Material investigated and the research method.** The Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was used in this research. The data were collected by a means of an open-ended questionnaire with request-prompting situations. The answers of 100 Lithuanian university undergraduates and 100 English university undergraduates (native speakers) were investigated. The classification and analysis of the data was based upon an adapted version of Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) coding scheme, designed to study requests as request sequences, made of a head act (the minimal unit of the realization of requests'

illocutionary force) and its internal and external modifications. Both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were applied in the study.

**Theoretical and practical value of the research.** This work is part of a larger body of similar contrastive studies on requests in other languages, contributing to the knowledge of requests as linguistically and culturally specific speech acts. In the context of Lithuanian linguistics, the work may be of value for expanding the notion of politeness in language, revealing it as a relative, situational phenomenon that is not restricted merely to language etiquette formulas, let alone prescriptive norms and rules. The study of spoken requests, though elicited through a written medium, a functional approach to the data, and a new way of classification and analysis of the material sheds new light on the peculiarities of Lithuanian requests, questioning some well-established beliefs about them.

The study may be useful for the teachers of both Lithuanian and English as foreign languages, since making a request appropriately and politely in a foreign language is very important and requires a good level of pragmatic competence of the learner. The author hopes that her research will be of interest to the general public as well, and all who have contacts with members of other linguistic and cultural groups.

**Theses to be defended:**

1. Both Lithuanian and the British English native speakers have a clear preference for conventional indirectness (CI) over any other request strategy. However, CI requests are less frequent in Lithuanian than in English. CI requests in both languages are typically performed by questioning a hearer's ability to carry out the desired action.
2. Lithuanians employ higher levels of directness (D) and do so in a larger variety of situations than the English. Notwithstanding, D Lithuanian requests dominate only in minimum face-threat (non-risky) request situations. D requests in both languages are typically expressed in imperative constructions.
3. Lithuanians employ more internal morphological modifications, but fewer and simpler syntactical modifications than the English.



4. The requests of Lithuanians are considerably less frequently mitigated by lexical and phrasal modifiers than those of the English, especially by particular formal words and desemantized introductory formulas.
5. Lithuanians and the English use similar amounts of various external request modifications, but the popularity of their particular groups also differs, the main difference being an inclination to demonstrate friendliness versus tactful respect.
6. Compared to the negatively polite English culture, the Lithuanians are more positive politeness-oriented. Lithuanian request realizations reflect less consideration for the hearer's personal freedom and privacy, less careful pessimism, and greater faith in a favourable outcome of a speech act, etc. However, Lithuanians make their requests polite by conveying closeness, creating a friendly atmosphere for interaction. The requests made by Lithuanians show a stronger intrinsic belief that people are obligated to help one another due to their intimate bonds or hierarchical relationships and that makes requests less negative face-threatening in Lithuanian.
7. Different polite ways of how to consider the other person when requesting are determined by the difference of Lithuanian and English cultural values, beliefs and perceptions.

**The structure of the work.** Besides the introductory part and general conclusions, the dissertation consists of three main parts.

Part 1 discusses the general theoretical issues of linguistic politeness, as well as politeness in requests in greater detail. Chapter 1.1. deals with the socio-cultural nature of the phenomenon of politeness. The difference is explained between the concepts of language etiquette and a pragmatic notion of linguistic politeness. The main classical views on linguistic politeness, along with postmodern approaches are presented, as is the choice of a theoretical basis for the study. Chapter 1.2. defines the research subject, introduces the main request strategies, discusses the connection between directness and politeness, reveals requests as linguistically and culturally specific speech acts, and reviews the most relevant empirical works on them.

Part 2 consists of a detailed description of the data collection and research methodology. Various possible ways of data collection are considered. The choice of the

DCT over other natural and experimental methods is explained, as is the process of adapting and applying this method for these particular research purposes.

Part 3, which consists of three main chapters, is the main section of the investigative study, dedicated to the analysis of Lithuanian and English request data that was gathered. Chapter 3.1. provides a contrastive analysis of direct (D) and conventionally indirect (CI) request strategies and sub-strategies, as well as non-conventionally indirect strategies (NCI) (hinting) and opting-out strategies (when a request is not made). Chapter 3.2. deals with internal grammatical request modifications, whereas Chapter 3.3. concentrates on their external modifiers, the so-called supportive moves. At the end of each chapter, the findings are summarized and conclusions are provided.

The end of the work consists of general conclusions, list of references (143 positions) and an annex with the research questionnaire in Lithuanian and English.

## REVIEW OF THE CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

### **1. Politeness as a relative sociocultural and linguistic phenomenon**

**1.1. Theoretical aspects of linguistic politeness.** Politeness is one of the basic socio-psychological guidelines for human behaviour, and an integral part of all human interaction (House 2005). Conventional ways to be polite are acquired in a process of socialization of an individual, and this process on its part is culturally determined. In different cultures, different ways to be polite are used, given priority and conventionalized.

The phenomenon of politeness is studied by various scientists in the humanities and social sciences, but mostly by linguists. The emergence of linguistic politeness as a subdiscipline of sociolinguistics and pragmatics is marked by the publication of the Face-saving Theory (Brown & Levinson 1987 [1978]). Although there is a lack of common agreement on the theoretical status and the scope of linguistic politeness (Kasper 2004, Watts et al. 1992), in most studies, politeness has been conceptualized as strategic conflict-avoidance or as a strategic construction of cooperative social interaction (see Eelen 2001, Watts 2003).

Seen from a linguistic pragmatics perspective, politeness is a theoretical construct, located within a theory of social behaviour and language use, delimited from various folk understandings and evaluations, and not equated with any moral or psychological disposition towards being nice to one's interlocutor (Fukushima 2000, Thomas 1995, Watts et al. 1992). Whereas the other more common view on politeness is known as politeness as a social norm approach (Fraser 1990). According to it, politeness is seen as appropriate social behaviour, a set of norms and rules in a particular society, or etiquette. It is this understanding that has been advocated in Lithuanian linguistics thus far (see e. g. Čepaitienė 2007, Kučinskaitė 1990). A substantial amount of research was carried out generalizing the norms of Lithuanian language etiquette, systemizing etiquette situations and formulas, describing their grammatical, semantic properties, and social and historical conditions of usage (see e.g. Baltrušaitis 1999, Bylaitė-Lapinskienė 2004a, 2004b; Čepaitienė 2007, 1999, 1998b; Grigas 1969; Jasiūnaitė 2000, 1999a, 1999b, 1997). A prescriptive stance is also very frequent, criticizing the use of

inappropriate linguistic formulas or inappropriate use of correct linguistic formulas, and equating codified standard Lithuanian language norms with Lithuanian politeness norms (see e.g. Čepaitienė & Steigvilaitė-Urbietienė 2003; Kučinskaitė 2003, 1990; Malakauskas 1994; Šukys 2003).

Linguistic politeness deals with the strategic choices of individuals and how they use the (socio)linguistic repertoire of politeness means available to them so that they use these means appropriately in a communicative event that is taking place. Thus, the concern is politeness in language usage. Putting S's (speaker's) communicative intention first, the research is not limited solely to the study of conventionalized language etiquette formulas (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2005, Larina 2005, Lubecka 2000). In fact, pragmatics analyze all utterances that are observed that they consider as conveying either respect or closeness to H (hearer) in a particular context. Politeness norms are seen as more flexible and more context-dependent (Spencer-Oatey 2000) while politeness itself is perceived as a more democratic concept to which purely descriptive attitudes are applied. It is precisely in this pragmatic way that linguistic politeness is understood by the author of the present dissertation i.e. as particular culturally specific ritualized communicative strategies which are used with a goal of achieving a smooth interaction by conveying either respect or friendliness to H, and these can be expressed with an indefinite variety of linguistic means.

The development of a pragmatic concept of linguistic politeness was influenced by Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle with its four Conversation Maxims (quality, quantity, relation, and manner), formulated on an assumption that the main purpose of conversation is the effective exchange of information. Even when this principle is not followed, it generates conversational implicatures which are non-explicit messages that H knows (s)he has to infer. The Cooperative Principle has constituted a basis of reference on which politeness rules and principles, like the ones of Lakoff (1973, 1975) and Leech (1983) have been built upon. However, although the perceptions of linguistic politeness as a conversational maxim contributed much to understanding the phenomenon, in the view of the many, the only approach which satisfies the criteria for empirical theories is the one offered by Brown & Levinson (1987).

Brown & Levinson were the first ones to systemize politeness as a linguistic theory and their model for strategic interaction has been the most influential thus far.

The Face-saving approach is built on the notion of *face* (Goffman 1967) which is a person's self-image that (s)he presents to the world. People's faces are linked by the ties of mutual vulnerability, and that is why it is usually in everyone's interests to take care of each other's faces when interacting. Every individual has two types of face, which are positive and negative. Positive face is likened to an individual's desire for closeness and acceptance, and negative face to a desire for personal freedom. The theory assumes that most speech acts (e.g. requests, compliments) inherently threaten either H's or S's face-wants, and that politeness is involved in redressing those face-threatening acts (FTA). Most attention is given to the consideration of H's face needs. Positive politeness aims at supporting or enhancing H's positive face, whereas negative politeness aims at softening the encroachment on H's freedom of action and freedom from imposition. The kind and amount of politeness that S applies to a certain speech act is determined by the weightiness of a FTA which is calculated from three social variables: the perceived social distance and power difference between S and H, and the absolute ranking of impositions in a particular culture. The bigger values of these variables, the bigger the face-threat and higher number and less direct speech acts performing strategy is employed:

- 1) bald on record (without redressive action);
- 2) bald on record with positive politeness;
- 3) bald on record with negative politeness;
- 4) off record;
- 5) do not carry out FTA.

The first strategy is employed when the face-threat is deemed to be minimal – either when politeness needs are overridden by efficiency needs, when the speech act is clearly performed for the hearer's benefit, or when S is socially much more powerful than H. In all these cases, a speech act be performed in the most direct, concise and unambiguous way. When applying the second and the third strategies, the FTA is mitigated by employing either positive or negative politeness. In the case of the fourth strategy, the FTA is carried out very indirectly, flouting one of Gricean (1975) maxims on the assumption that the H is able to infer the intended meaning. Finally, when the estimated riskiness of a speech act is evaluated as too big, the S might choose not to carry out a FTA at all.

Brown & Levinson concentrate primarily on the second and the third strategies, their sub-strategies and concrete linguistic means by which to use the selected sub-strategy successfully. Examples of positive politeness sub-strategies are ‘notice, attend to H (his/her interests, wants, needs, goods)’, ‘presuppose/raise/assert common ground’, ‘seek agreement’, ‘use in-group identity markers’, ‘be optimistic’, ‘joke’ etc., while instances of the sub-strategies addressed to the H’s negative face are the following: ‘be conventionally indirect’, ‘question, hedge’, ‘be pessimistic’, ‘minimize the imposition’, ‘give deference’, or ‘apologize’. Positive politeness is approach-based and free-ranging. The potential face-threat is minimized in this case by decreasing the existing distance between H and S, showing that S considers H to be in important respects ‘the same’ as (s)he, with in-groups rights and duties and expectations of reciprocity. Negative politeness on its part is essentially avoidance-based, characterized by self-effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to very restricted aspects of H’s self-image, centering on his/her wants to be unimpeded and focused primarily on minimizing the effect of the FTA on H.

According to Brown & Levinson, it is realizations of negative politeness that are mostly included in books on etiquette and all things being equal, it is safer to assume that H prefers his negative face needs to be attended to more than the positive face needs, making the application of positive politeness more limited. The authors do not explicitly state that negative politeness is more important than positive politeness, but this idea is implicated in the hierarchy of the strategies, and the fact that negative politeness is given much more space in their publication compared to positive politeness. However, although politeness as such is a universal phenomenon, as everyone has fundamental face concerns, as the theory maintains, culture can affect the relative sensitivity of different aspects of people’s face, as well as which strategies are the most important for face-management (Spencer-Oatey 2000, Sifianou 2000).

Most of the research on politeness during the past three decades may be characterized as somehow related to Brown & Levinson’s study (1987). Although various aspects of the theory have been more or less justifiably criticized (see e. g. Fukushima 2000, Márquez Reiter 2000, Mills 2003, Watts 2003), until very recently, only sporadic attempts have been made to suggest alternative frameworks (e.g. Watts et al 1992, Culpeper 1996). The advent of postmodern theories on linguistic politeness

marked a new era of research of politeness as a discursive phenomenon. Recent work on politeness, which is ‘breaking away from the grip of linguistic pragmatics’, focuses on its ‘chameleon-like’ character (Watts 2003) and the ways in which it is negotiated in discourse in particular communities of practice (Mills 2003). A discursive approach, and interesting and challenging critique has opened up the possibility for greater theoretical and analytical sophistication, but this approach is still quite eclectic, and with a need for a greater theoretical clarity (Mills 2009).

While post-modern theorists shift their focus towards the investigation of how people *disagree* on what constitutes politeness, cross-cultural research aims to establish how they *agree* on what is polite, and how they do that in different cultures (Ogiermann 2009). The classical Face-saving Theory, with its distinction between positive and negative types of politeness, has been the most preferred framework in contrastive work on requests in a wide range of languages (see e.g. Fukushima 2000; Márquez Reiter 2000; Rue, Zhang 2008; Sifianou 1992) and was considered as ideally suitable for the present study as well.

**1.2. Requests in linguistic politeness research.** Requests enjoy a central position in both speech act theory (Austin 1962, Searle 1979) and politeness theories. In this work, a request is defined as a speech act through which S wants to get H to do something that is generally in the interest of S and demands a bigger or smaller effort or exertion on the part of H. Requests are of an ‘optative’ nature (Vaitkevičiūtė 1964), meaning that H is not actually obliged to submit to the will of S.

Depending on the level of their indirectness, i.e. how much the linguistic form of a request coincides with its communicative function, three major levels of directness in requests, or request strategies, can be distinguished (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain 1984):

- **direct** requests, explicit ones, syntactically or semantically marked as such, e.g. imperatives, (hedged) performatives, obligation, want statements (e.g. *Open the window, I’d like to ask / I want / need you to open the window*).
- **conventionally indirect** requests, realized by reference to some of the request’s felicity conditions (Searle 1975), necessary for its performance, as conventionalized in a given language. These are preparatory conditions, such as H’s ability or willingness to carry out a request (e.g. *Could you open / do*

*you want to open the window?*), or the non-obviousness of the speech act (e.g. *Will you open the window?*). There are some linguistic signals and a common agreement that automatically tie such indirect forms with the request's function, making them easily recognizable as requests even without any contextual support.

- ***non-conventionally indirect*** (off-record) requests make an open-ended group of various hints, made by partial reference to the object or element needed for the implementation of the act or by reliance on contextual clues (e.g. *Why is the window still open? It's getting cold*).

The first theoreticians with English as their mother tongue (e.g. Brown, Levinson 1987; Clark, Schunk 1980; Leech 1983) equated indirectness with politeness, while viewing pragmatic clarity and directness as a lack of concern for H's face. However, this was not supported by the empirical research (see e.g. Blum-Kulka's 1987 experiment). While there is probably a direct link between conventional indirectness and politeness, the most indirect utterances are not deemed as the most polite by the speakers of various languages. Moreover, many lingua-cultural communities (e.g. Polish, Russian, Greek, and Chinese) tend to opt for direct requests more than Anglo-Saxons, but it does not give a reason to judge them as being less polite (Lubecka 2000, Sifianou 1992, Wierzbicka 1985). In a given context, one culture's social norms can allow for a degree of directness (or indirectness) that can be considered offensive (e.g. blunt, imperious or, on the contrary, too obscure and/or insincere) to the other (Blum-Kulka 1982, Wierzbicka 1985). However, whatever the degree of indirectness of a particular request, it is neither polite nor impolite by itself, but should be judged by taking cultural relativity of politeness perceptions and norms into consideration.

Conventionally indirect requests strongly dominate in cultures that are negative politeness oriented, while more positive politeness oriented communities use larger amounts of direct requests. It was proved that rather than threatening H's negative face, requests can also transmit closeness and intimacy, strengthening interpersonal relationships, thus positive politeness is important here as well (Márquez Reiter 2000, Sifianou 2000). While direct requests are commonly associated with positive politeness, and conventionally indirect with negative politeness, the non-conventionally indirect



strategy is seen as a very mixed strategy as far as politeness is concerned (Márquez Reiter 2000; Rinnert & Kobayashi 1999; Sifianou 2000).

Much of cross-cultural pragmatics research has focused on pragmalinguistic norms associated with the performance of different speech acts in different languages and cultural groups. Requests have been extensively investigated in particular. The largest study so far was the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) which has inspired many other similar investigations (Fukushima 1996, 2000; Hong 1998; Márquez Reiter 2000; Ogiermann 2009; Rue & Zhang 2008; Sifianou 1992; Van Mulken 1996 to name but a few). However, most of these works deal with different varieties of English, Western European languages and Oriental languages.

In the existing literature on Lithuanian requests, a prescriptive normative language etiquette perspective is mostly used (see e. g. Kučinskaitė 2003, 1990; Čepaitienė & Steigvilaitė-Urbietienė 2003; Šukys 2003). The most significant purely descriptive study was written by Čepaitienė (2007). In a separate comprehensive chapter of this monograph, a large variety of possible ways to make a request in Lithuanian are thoroughly classified and described, also taking the social relationships of the interlocutors into account. However for this work, which is mainly based on the written language data, the speech acts were collected and analyzed starting from their linguistic forms, while the social context of the usage and politeness meanings are mostly revealed from their semantics. The data collection method used presupposed a selection of mostly explicit, direct requests for the study, leaving conventionally indirect requests underrepresented, while non-conventional requests were not covered at all. What Čepaitienė (2007) did not claim to show is how many and how frequently the variety of linguistic request expression resources presented are employed in contemporary spoken Lithuanian. This is what the author of the present dissertation aimed at employing a functional rather than a formal approach to the data.

## **2. The data collection and research methodology**

After careful consideration of alternative natural and experimental ways of data collection, taking their feasibility and data validity into account, the written Discourse

Completion Test (DCT) (open-ended questionnaire) was chosen. Despite the criticism DCT data have received for not adequately rendering authentic speech (see e.g. Hikel 1997, Kasper 2000, Márquez Reiter 2000, Rintell & Mitchell 1989, Van Mulken 1996, Weizman 1989), DCTs have an advantage over ‘natural’ data in that they provide a controlled context, and can be used to collect large amounts of data quite quickly, as well as to create initial classifications of formulas and strategies that may occur in natural speech. And even if DCT responses constitute idealized data, they reliably illustrate the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic norms and values of the respondents’ cultures; this makes it possible to generalize what is typical and acceptable in a particular culture and compare politeness across cultures (Beebe & Cummings 1996, Byon 2006, Billmyer & Varghese 2000, Marti 2005, Ogiermann 2009, Rose 1992, Yuan 2001).

The questionnaire used for this study consisted of twelve scenarios, which were designed to elicit requests. Situations from every-day and academic life were chosen after checking their authenticity with the native speakers of both languages. The twelve scenarios were created including all possible combinations of the following three main contextual variables (see Table 1):

- **social distance** (degree of emotional and psychological closeness between H and S);
- **social power** (how much right, basing on his/her social status S has to influence the behaviour of H);
- **size or request** (the physical or psychological cost of the request to H; includes both the thing asked and the rights and obligations of the interlocutors in a particular context).

Table 1. Short descriptions of the scenarios and the combinations of contextual variables in them

Scenarios	Social distance	Social power	Size of request	Face-threat
1. Student asks his/her friend to fetch him a magazine (1S-Magazine)	-SD	S=H	-SR	-FT
2. Professor asks the student to close a window in a lecture hall (2S-Window)	+SD	S>H	-SR	-FT
3. Student asks his/her course-mate to host his friend for two weeks (3S-Friend)	-SD	S=H	+SR	+FT

4. Student asks another student in a refectory to move a little by the table ( <i>4S-Refectory</i> )	+SD	S=H	-SR	-FT
5. Lecturer asks the student to make the presentation earlier ( <i>5S-Presentation</i> )	+SD	S>H	+SR	+FT
6. Student ask his/her neighbour in the hall of residence to turn the loud music down ( <i>6S-Music</i> )	+SD	S=H	+SR	+FT
7. Mother asks her son to get her some products from the shop ( <i>7S-Shop</i> )	-SD	S>H	+SR	+FT
8. Student asks his/her uncle for a cottage for a semester-end party ( <i>8S-Cottage</i> )	-SD	S<H	+SR	+FT
9. Student asks his/her little sister to pick up the phone ( <i>9S-Phone</i> )	-SD	S>H	-SR	-FT
10. Student asks his/her lecturer for an extension for an essay ( <i>10S-Essay</i> )	+SD	S<H	+SR	+FT
11. Student asks department's secretary for a piece of paper ( <i>11S-Paper</i> )	+SD	S<H	-SR	-FT
12. Student asks his/her doctor, a family friend, to prescribe him/her a medical test ( <i>12S-Prescription</i> )	-SD	S<H	-SR	-FT

+SD – social distance is large, -SD – small

S>H – the S is of a higher status, S<H – the H is of a higher status, S=H – the S and the H are equals

+SR – size of request is big, -SR – small

+FT – estimated face-threat (determined by the values of the contextual variables) big, -FT – small

The survey was conducted in Lithuania and England in April-June 2008. The respondents were university students (mainly from Vilnius University and Hull University) doing their first degree in various subjects not related to linguistics. Although around 270 participants were engaged in the project, some of the questionnaires had to be excluded because they were incomplete or because respondents had a different native language from those analyzed. To ensure comparability across groups, the amount of DCTs was further reduced to ensure equal distribution between genders and equal size of samples in each of the languages. The questionnaires which were removed from the corpus were chosen randomly, allowing for the creation of a corpus containing 100 Lithuanian and 100 English DCTs (with 50 females and 50 males in each group). The questionnaires were completed in the presence of the researcher after some standardized oral instructions were given, emphasizing the importance of as spontaneous answers as possible. In order not to distort the data, the respondents were neither explicitly told to produce requests, nor did they know that it is a contrastive study on politeness.

The data coding and analysis scheme was based on Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) framework. First of all, the request head acts (minimal units realizing request's illocutionary force) were identified, e.g.:

*Klausyk, norėčiau kai ko tavęs paprašyti. Gal gali padaryti man paslaugą? Ar pas tave dviem savaitėm neatsirastų vietos mano vienai draugei iš Kauno? (head act) Tavo butukas, aišku, nedidelis, bet... Matai, aš jai buvau žadėjęs, kad gali pas mane pagyventi, bet taip išėjo, kad tuo metu jau būsiu užsieny, kai ji atvažiuos, o savo kambarį jau išnuomojau ir nežinau dabar, ką daryt... Nelabai turiu ko daugiau prašyt šiuo metu. Ji prisidėtų prie komunalinių. Būčiau be galo be krašto dėkinga ir skolinga šokolado! (3S-Friend)*

*Hi uncle Nick, it's Dan. My friends and I are wanting to throw a party at the end of the semester and I was wondering if you might let us use your cottage again? (head act) I know, we managed to break your table a couple of years ago, but I promise I won't be bringing many friends and we've grown up a little since then and will be a little more careful! (8S-Cottage)*

Head act strategies and substrategies with illustrating examples are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Request head act strategies and substrategies

<b>Direct (D) strategy</b>	
<b>1. Imperative</b>	<i>Rūta, atsiliepk! (9S-Phone)</i> <i>Pick it up Jane. (9S-Phone)</i>
<b>2. Explicit performative</b>	<i>Prašau uždaryti langą. (2S-Window)</i> <i>I ask you to prepare it in three days. (5S-Presentation)</i>
<b>3. Hedged performative</b>	<i>Norėčiau paprašyti siuntimo. (12S-Prescription)</i> <i>Turiu prašyti, kad jį pristatytumėte anksčiau (5S-Presentation).</i>  <i>I'd like to ask you for a small extension. (10S-Essay)</i> <i>I'm going to have to ask you to do it sooner. (5S-Presentation)</i>
<b>4. Obligation statement</b>	<i>Reikia skubiai sulakstyti į parduotuvę. (7S-Shop)</i> <i>Pranešimą turėsi skaityti šią savaitę. (5S-Presentation)</i>  <i>I need you to nip out to the shop for me. (7S-Shop)</i> <i>You should make your presentation this week. (5S-Presentation)</i>
<b>5. Want statement</b>	<i>Noriu, kad trumpam pritildytum. (6S-Music)</i> <i>Savo darbą norėčiau pristatyti truputį vėliau. (10S-Essay)</i>  <i>I want you to pop down to the shop for me. (7S-Shop)</i> <i>I would like you to do your presentation this week. (5S-Presentation)</i>
<b>Conventionally indirect (CI) strategy</b>	
<b>6. Reference to request's felicity conditions:</b>	

– action’s feasibility preparatory condition	<i>Gal galite truputį pasislinkti? (4S-Refectory)</i> <i>Gal galima pas jus sodyboje? (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Can you pass the magazine please? (1S-Magazine)</i> <i>Could I please have an extension? (10S-Essay)</i>
– H’s willingness preparatory condition	<i>Gal nori su draugu pabėgēt man iki parduotuvės? (7S-Shop)</i> <i>Paduotum man tą žurnalą? (1S-Magazine)</i> <i>Would you mind closing the window? (2S-Window)</i> <i>Would you go down to the shop? (7S-Shop)</i>
– action’s non-obviousness condition	<i>Atsiliepsi? (9S-Phone)</i> <i>Will you get it? (9S-Phone)</i>
<b>Non-conventionally indirect (NCI) strategy</b>	
<b>7. Hints</b>	<i>Tavo pranešimas labai tiktų kitam seminarui. (5S-Presentation)</i> <i>Mes labai ieškom ploto sesijai atšvęsti. (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Ar jums taip pat šalta? (2S-Window)</i>  <i>A small extension would really help me out. (10S-Essay)</i> <i>Just wanted to know what your cottage was doing. (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>I have a mate who needs a place to crash for a few weeks. (3S-Friend)</i>

Head acts might be mitigated by various grammatical or lexical and phrasal means, the presence of which is not essential for the utterance to be understood as a request. Categories of such internal modifications of the request proper and their examples appear in Table 3.

Table 3. Internal request head act modifications

<b>Internal morphological and syntactical modifications</b>	
<b>1. Subjunctive</b>	<i>Norėčiau paprašyti patildyti muziką. (6S-Music)</i> <i>Gal dar ir aš tilpčiau? (4S-Refectory)</i> <i>Ar galėtumėt duoti lapą popieriaus? (11S-Paper)</i> <i>Ar būtų įmanoma dar kartą apsilankyti jūsų sodyboje? (8S-Cottage)</i>  <i>You <u>should</u> do it this week. (5S-Presentation)</i> <i><u>Could</u> I get a sheet of paper? (11S-Paper)</i> <i><u>Would</u> you take the edge off? (6S-Music)</i> <i><u>Would</u> it be ok for Sue to stay at yours? (3S-Friend)</i>
<b>2. Negated preparatory condition + subjunctive</b>	<i>Nenorėtumėt pertraukos pasidaryt ir palėkt iki parduotuvės? (7S-Shop)</i> <i>Ar <u>negalėčiau</u> pasikviesti keletą draugų į sodybą? (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Ar <u>neleistumėte</u> atšvęsti sesijos pabaigos pas jus sodyboj? (8S-Cottage)</i>  <i>You <u>couldn't</u> move over a bit, could you? (4S-Refectory)</i> <i>I <u>couldn't</u> nick a sheet of paper, could I? (11S-Paper)</i> <i>You <u>wouldn't</u> fancy putting her up for a bit? (3S-Friend)</i>

<b>3. Conditional clause (+ subjunctive)</b>	<p><i>Noriu jūsų paprašyti, <u>kad pritildytumėt muziką.</u> (6S-Music)</i>  <i>Reikia, <u>kad pranešimą skaitytumėte po trijų dienų.</u> (5S-Presentation)</i>  <i>Norėčiau, <u>kad savo pranešimą pristatytum jau šią savaitę.</u> (5S-Presentation)</i></p> <p><i>Is there any chance <u>I can squeeze in there?</u> (4S-Refectory)</i>  <i><u>Would you mind if I joined you?</u> (4S-Refectory)</i>  <i><u>Would it be possible if you could put her up?</u> (3S-Friend)</i></p>
<b>4. Conditional clause + past tense (+ subjunctive)</b>	<p><i>Norėjau paprašyti, <u>kad leistumėte pristatyti referatą vėliau.</u> (10S-Essay)</i>  <i>Pagalvojau, <u>kad gal pas jus sodyboj būtų galima?</u> (8S-Cottage)</i></p> <p><i>I wondered if I could get an extension? (10S-Essay)</i>  <i>I thought it might be more appropriate for you to do this in the next seminar. (5S-Presentation)</i></p>
<b>5. Conditional clause + negation (+ subjunctive)</b>	<p><i>Noriu sužinoti, <u>ar nebūtų įmanoma sodyboj?</u> (8S-Cottage)</i>  <i>I don't suppose I could sit here? (4S-Refectory)</i></p>
<b>6. Other more complex combinations</b>	<p><i>Tikiuosi, <u>nesukelčiau jums nepatogumų prašydamas būti pasiruošus po trijų dienų?</u> (5S-Presentation)</i>  <i>Norėjau paklausti ir paprašyti, <u>ar negalėčiau darbą atiduoti keliomis dienomis vėliau?</u> (10S-Essay)</i></p> <p><i>Do you think it would be best if we closed the window? (2S-Window)</i>  <i>I just wanted to ask you if it'd be ok if I could borrow your cottage for a party (8S-Cottage)</i></p>
<b>Internal lexical and phrasal modifications</b>	
<b>1. Requestive markers</b>	<p><i>Do you mind closing the window <u>please.</u> (2S-Window)</i>  <i>Prašom / prašau / <u>prašyčiau</u> uždaryti langą. (2S-Window)</i></p>
<b>2. Understaters</b>	<p><i>Ar gali <u>truputį</u> pasislinkti? (4S-Refectory)</i>  <i>Gal galėtum pritildyti muziką <u>valandėlei?</u> (6S-Music)</i></p> <p><i>Would you mind sliding over <u>a little bit</u> please? (4S-Refectory)</i>  <i>Pass that magazine <u>a second.</u> (1S-Magazine)</i></p>
<b>3. Lexical hedges</b>	<p><i>Galbūt atsirastų pas jus <u>koks nors</u> atliekamas lapas? (11S-Paper)</i>  <i>Gal <u>kartais</u> Jurgai būtų galimybė pagyventi pas tave? (3S-Friend)</i></p> <p><i>Would it be <u>anyhow</u> possible for you to do it in three days? (5S-Presentation)</i>  <i>Could you <u>perhaps</u> turn the music down? (6S-Music)</i></p>
<b>4. Appealers</b>	<p><i>Paduok žurnalą, <u>gerai / ką / a?</u> (2S-Window)</i>  <i>Peter go to the shop for me, <u>ok / all right / will you?</u> (6S-Shop)</i></p>
<b>5. Openers</b>	<p><i><u>Kaip manai, gal galėtum...</u> ? (5S-Presentation)</i>  <i><u>Pamaniau, kad gal galėtum...</u> ? (3S-Friend)</i>  <i><u>Gal yra galimybė...</u> ? (8S-Cottage)</i>  <i><u>Ar galiu paprašyti...</u> ? (11S-Paper)</i>  <i><u>Būčiau labai dėkingas, jei...</u> (5S-Presentation)</i></p>

	<u>Would there be a chance...? (5S-Presentation)</u> <u>Can I ask you...? (11S-Paper)</u> <u>Would you be happy...? (5S-Presentation)</u> <u>I was wondering if...? (12S-Prescription)</u> <u>I'd really appreciate it if... (5S-Presentation)</u> <u>You wouldn't fancy...?(3S-Friend)</u>
--	--

A head act might also be externally modified by various additional semantic components, occurring either before or after it. These components can be separate speech acts (e.g. compliments, apologies), but when making a request function as supportive moves for the head act. The groups of external modifications singled out and their examples can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. External request head act modifications

External request head act modifications	
<b>1. Noticing the hearer</b>	<i>Labas, dėde, kaip šeima, vaikai? (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Gražiai šiandien atrodo. (3S-Friend)</i>  <i>Alright mate, how's it going? (6S-Music)</i> <i>Your place is so lovely! (8S-Cottage)</i>
<b>2. Preparatory statements</b>	<i>Turiu didelį ir svarbų prašymą. (3S-Friend)</i> <i>Turiu bėdą. (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Man labai reikia tavo pagalbos. (3S-Friend)</i>  <i>I have a favour to ask you. (3S-Friend)</i> <i>My close friend has a bit of a problem. (3S-Friend)</i> <i>I need you to do a big favour. (3S-Friend)</i>
<b>3. Preparatory questions</b>	<i>Gal galėtumėte skirti man minutėlę? (10S-Essay)</i> <i>Ar galėčiau kai ko paprašyti?(3S-Friend)</i> <i>Pas tave tame butuke labai ankšta? (3S-Friend)</i>  <i>Can I have a word? (10S-Essay)</i> <i>Could I ask you a massive favour please? (3S-Friend))</i> <i>Are you going to be in the town during the next two weeks? (3S-Friend)</i>
<b>4. Seeking precommitment</b>	<i>Ar negalėtum pagelbėti? (3S-Friend)</i> <i>Gal galėtum padaryti paslaugą nemažą? (3S-Friend)</i>  <i>Please will you help me? (12S-Prescription)</i> <i>Can you do me a huge favour? (7S-Shop)</i>
<b>5. Acknowledgment of aggravating</b>	<i>Žinau, kad aną kartą buvo truputį nuostuolio, bet... (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Suprantu, kad tai ne jūsu problema, bet... (10-Essay)</i>

<b>circumstances</b>	<i>I realize that you'd be wary after last time, but... (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>I know it is sooner than originally planned but.... (5S-Presentation)</i>
<b>6. Grounders, reasons</b>	<i>Norime su draugais šiek tiek atsipalaiduoti po sesijos. (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Manau, jau pakankamai prasivėdino. (2S-Window)</i>  <i>The place is packed. (4S-Refectory)</i> <i>I'm trying to get some work done and your music's really loud. (6S-Music)</i>
<b>7. Excuses, justifications</b>	<i>Atsiprašau, kad užlaikiu jus po paskaitos, bet... (5S-Presentation)</i> <i>Man tikrai labai nepatogu dar kartą prašyt. (8S-Cottage)</i>  <i>Really sorry to bother you, but... (7S-Shop)</i> <i>I hate to ask, but I haven't got much of choice. (3S-Friend)</i>
<b>8. Promises, suggestions</b>	<i>Mes viską paskui sutvarkysim. (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Po pietų pažadu desertą. (7S-Shop)</i>  <i>Nothing too extreme! (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>You can get some chocolate or something for troubles. (7S-Shop)</i>
<b>9. Expressions of gratitude</b>	<i>Būsiu tikrai labai dėkinga. (3S-Friend)</i> <i>Man taip būtų daug patogiau. (5S-Presentation)</i>  <i>I'd be most grateful. (5S-Presentation)</i> <i>It would be a great help. (3S-Friend)</i>
<b>10. Offers to refuse</b>	<i>Žinoma, tai nėra būtina. (5S-Presentation)</i> <i>Jeigu spėtum pasiruošti jam anksčiau ir nesi užsiėmusi. (5S-Presentation)</i>  <i>You can say no if you want to. (3S-Friend)</i> <i>I'll make another arrangement if you aren't compatible with it. (5S-Presentation)</i>
<b>11. Appeals to H's goodness, pleas</b>	<i>Prašau, dėde! (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>Būk geras! (8S-Cottage)</i>  <i>Please please please! (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>You would be a life saver! (5S-Presentation)</i>
<b>12. Jokes, irony</b>	<i>Ji labai šauni – kaip ir aš! (3S-Friend)</i> <i>Tai dabar ir vargstu kaip kilbukas puoduke. (3S-Friend)</i> <i>Mokesčių inspekcija, girdėjom, nelegaliai sodybą vandalams nuomojat. (8S-Cottage)</i>  <i>I know you love me really! (8S-Cottage)</i> <i>...because your mamma's all old and tired. (7S-Shop)</i>
<b>13. Aggravating moves</b>	<i>Neatsisakyk padėti! (3S-Friend)</i> <i>Tikriausiai nesupranti, kad čia ne namai, todėl turi atsizvelgt į kitus. (6S-Music)</i> <i>I'm sure it won't be a problem. (5S-Presentation)</i> <i>People are trying to work. (6S-Music)</i>



### 3. Contrastive analysis of Lithuanian and English requests

**3.1. Request strategies.** The results of the investigation have revealed some very clear common patterns in Lithuanian and English request strategies and their usage, as well as statistically significant differences (in 9 out of 12 situations).

Both respondent groups mostly opted for a conventionally indirect (CI) strategy, but Lithuanians favoured it 20 % less than the English (LT – 64 %, ENG – 81.7 %). CI requests in both languages, Lithuanian especially, typically take the form of indirect questions about the feasibility of a desired action (LT – 90.1 %, ENG – 72.8 %). S usually questions H's ability to fulfil it (e.g. *Gal gali...? Can you...?*) (LT – 57.6 %, ENG – 52.9 %), and less frequently seeks H's permission for an action to be carried out (e.g. *Ar galiu...? Can I...?*) (LT – 23.2 %, ENG – 29.9 %) or checks if there is a possibility for it to occur (e.g. *Gal galima...? Is there any chance of...?*) (LT – 18.2 %, ANG – 15.4 %). Indirect questions about H's willingness to comply with a request take the second largest group, though they were much more common among answers by the English (LT – 9.8 %, ENG – 20.7 %) where they also often appeared in very conventionalized formulas.

The analysis of particular request situations has revealed that indirectness levels in Lithuanian requests are lowered much more by such contextual factors as small social distance and S's dominance over H. While it is only in minimum face-threat situations (*1S-Magazine, 9S-Phone*) where the drop in the number of CI English requests becomes more distinct, Lithuanian direct (D) requests are more numerous than CI requests in such contexts.

Lithuanian D requests out-numbered English requests nearly three times more in general (LT – 26.9 %, ENG – 10.9 %), and 2–30 times more in some particular situations (e.g. *2S-Window, 6S-Music*). In both groups, D requests were mostly addressed to intimates (small social distance), but the Lithuanian norms of politeness appear to sanction not only considerably more, but also a wider usage of D requests in a larger variety of contexts. However, contrary to a widely shared conviction about D requests being the most common type of Lithuanian requests (e.g. Čepaitienė 2007, Kučinskaitė 1990), they were found to dominate merely in minimum face-threat situations. Moreover, the data shows that D explicit performatives (nearly non-existent

in English – 0.8 %) that were traditionally taken for the most typical Lithuanian requests, are very rare in actual usage (LT – 4.7 %) and mostly limited to formal situations, as they not only carry a socio-pragmatic meanings of respect, but also reserve and coldness, which is unwelcome in communication among intimates. The majority of both Lithuanian and English D requests were expressed with imperative mood constructions (LT – 79.5 %, ENG – 84.6 %).

The Lithuanian respondents not only used notably more D requests, but also used slightly larger numbers of non-conventionally indirect (NCI) requests when compared to the English (LT – 6.6 %, ENG – 4.5 %). Due to the small number of hints elicited, it was not possible to observe more distinct patterns in their function and in the variation of their frequency according to the social constraints. The main finding is that in most of situations with larger numbers of Lithuanian D requests, more NCI hints were found as well. The analysis of the NCI requests and the cases of opting out (LT – 2.5 %, ENG – 2.9%) has revealed a dynamic and complex character of request situations. The choices of how to reach one's communicative goal are by no means limited to pragmatically transparent D or CI requests: addressees not only use various ambiguous illocutionary acts (ambiguous both illocutionary force-wise as well as politeness-wise), but also due to various reasons ask for less than intended, decide not to make a request at all, or find alternative solutions how to satisfy their needs, etc.

CI requests convey S's understanding that (s)he is imposing on H, show his/her respect for H's personal time and space, expresses uncertainty in the outcome of the speech act, provide H with a theoretical possibility to decline a request. The results of the present study have confirmed that CI requests really make the core of English request strategies, since they perfectly attend to a great need of negative politeness in the overly individualistic English culture (see Hofstede 1991) where personal privacy is of ultimate importance (Fox 2005). As the findings of the present research demonstrate, even when asking for minor things in small social distance situations, the English tend adopt a politeness-wise 'safer' CI strategy.

The Lithuanian answers, on their part, reveal less cultural priority given to keeping a distance and avoidance of imposition on the freedom of the H. In the more collectivist Lithuanian society (Kavolis 1993, Mockaitis 2002), the existing politeness norms permit more optimistic and positively polite directness which strengthens or

builds up ties among people, and appeals to their mutual responsibilities and commitments towards one another. Distance for Lithuanians is likely to be more negatively marked, thus requests for small things from intimates not only can, but even must be issued very directly. Tactful CI utterances, especially those questioning H's willingness to comply, in such contexts are likely to be either taken for direct 'yes/no' questions or judged as too formal, cold, mannered, insincere or even offensive because of a lack of a belief in close bonds between the interlocutors, their readiness to help each other, etc. Since Lithuanians rank higher on the power distance index (Hofstede 1991, Mockaitis 2002) which means that they are more inclined to demonstrate and tolerate social power differences among people, some D requests are perceived as polite enough based upon the higher social status of S.

**3.2. Internal request modifications.** 56.5 % of all Lithuanian and 62.3 % of all English request head acts were modified either syntactically or morphologically, or both, with higher numbers of these modifiers in bigger and lower in smaller face-threat situations.

Subjunctive mood constructions were identified as convincingly dominant in the answers of both respondent groups, however there were even more of them in Lithuanian requests than in the English. These constructions alone, including their negated forms (more frequent in Lithuanian requests too) made the overwhelming majority of all grammatical modifications used by Lithuanians. A crucial role of morphological modifiers is also played by verb inflections (second person plural forms), which are available in Lithuanian, but not in English.

Compared to the English, Lithuanians did not appear to elaborate their requests as much syntactically. They produced fewer requests in conditional sentences with various combinations of morphological modifiers in them. Therefore, although the grammatically modified Lithuanian speech acts under question were only slightly less numerous than those of the English, the results of the investigation demonstrate a very clear pattern that Lithuanians tend to modify their requests by less structurally complex grammatical means than the English. Elaborate syntactic structures have a similar politeness effect to that of conventional indirectness, letting S to express his/her communicative intension not so very directly, but nevertheless clear enough. Great elaboration conveys S's infirmness to approach the matter directly and show that s(he)

does not in fact foster any big expectations that his/her wish will be fulfilled, consequently H feels less imposed upon and on safer ground to decline the request.

57.2 % of Lithuanian and 78.7 % of all English requests elicited were modified by specific words or phrases carrying a politeness function. While it was lexical hedges that were the most favoured by Lithuanians, request openers, which are various introductory phrases, were the most common group of these modifications among the English.

Lithuanians used both substantially fewer openers and demonstrated a much smaller variety of these means available in their language, while the English produced a very wide range of semantically complex desemantized and conventionalized introductory formulas. As for hedges, there were found 6 times more in Lithuanian than in English. Notwithstanding, the majority of the observed cases in this group feature the Lithuanian particles *gal* and *galbūt*, usually used as question words, while the English have employed fewer lexical hedges, but used a larger repertoire of them. The number of Lithuanian requestive markers *prašom*, *prašau*, *prašyčiau* is more than 10 times smaller than the number of *please*, which was the second most common English modifier in the reviewed group. This can be easily explained by the functional inequivalence of these formally equivalent requestive markers in Lithuanian and in English. The findings of the investigation allow one to state that the afore-mentioned Lithuanian words, especially when used correctly as performatives, are rare when requesting, thus they cannot be deemed as polite, as was earlier maintained in Lithuanian linguistics. Due to the socio-pragmatic meanings of formality and coldness ascribed to them, and their directness (when used as performatives), Lithuanian requestive markers were observed only in more formal contexts and only in small face-threat situations.

Overall, when compared to the English, lexical and phrasal modifications, especially those that are formal, are much less characteristic of Lithuanian requests. However, feeling less of need for lexical and phrasal mitigations, Lithuanians make their utterances polite enough by the use of understators, diminutives, and appealers, while in natural speech, a friendly intonation as well as appropriate paralinguistic and non-verbal signs also play a crucial role here.

Grammatical modifications and formal lexical and phrasal modifications are all primarily focused on minimizing the imposition of the request. Application of these means makes it possible to make a speech act in a less assured, more respectful and

detached way. At the same, when implying that a positive reaction is not highly expected and responsibility for what is being said is avoided, S can be more sure about his/her own face. The fact that the Lithuanian respondents invested less into the internal modifications of their request head acts in general, and that their utterances were less structurally and semantically elaborated, with fewer conventionalized forms and formulas used, further shows that Lithuanians are more positive politeness-oriented than the English.

**3.3. External modifications.** Nearly the same amount of requests in both languages were supported by various additional semantic components external to the request proper (LT – 64.1 %, ENG – 64.6 %). Just like in the case of internal modifiers, their numbers increase with the increase of a face-threat in particular situations.

There were some very clear common patterns in the Lithuanian and English choices as to how to support their request head acts externally. The most numerous external modifications in both groups that were identified were grounders or reasons for the requests, while various suggestions and promises to H took second place. However there were also clear differences. Lithuanians provided fewer grounders, but were more inclined to make suggestions and promises than the English, especially ones of reward. While using only slightly fewer preparatory questions, it was more typical for Lithuanians than the English to prepare H for the speech act by stating an existing problem that motivates a request, or directly expressing the need for H's help. Lithuanians apologized less for impeding, offered a possibility for H not to comply less, expressed less consciousness that there might be some aggravating circumstances hindering the implementation of the desired action.

The results reveal that the Lithuanians show more contact-building and common-ground building attitudes in their external request modifications, as it was much more common for them to express friendliness to H by becoming involved in phatic communication, implicitly and especially explicitly appealing to his/her kindness, making jokes, or using irony. However, it appeared that it is more acceptable for Lithuanians to pressure H rather than avoid imposition using softer or harsher request aggravating moves. Lithuanians do not appear to avoid a display of either positive or negative emotions when requesting as much as the English.

## CONCLUSIONS

After the contrastive analysis of Lithuanian and English requests and their politeness, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The results show that the choices of Lithuanian and English request strategies are governed by common socio-pragmatic and politeness principles. However some statistically significant differences were also found.

1.1. The most typical Lithuanian and English requests are conventionally indirect (CI) (LT – 64.0 %, ENG – 81.7 %). This is in line with the results of most of the previous studies which also found the CI strategy to be the most universal request strategy in various languages.

1.3. The most common way to make a CI request in both groups is by referring to the precondition of the feasibility or possibility of a desired action. However, this substrategy was favoured more by Lithuanians (LT – 90.1 %, ENG – 72.8 %), who appeared to be less concerned with more subjective precondition of H's willingness to comply with a request than the English (LT – 9.8 %, ENG – 20.7 %).

1.2. Lithuanians used nearly 20 % less CI requests than the English. The numbers of Lithuanian CI requests drop visibly in situations of a small social distance and/or S's dominance over H, while in the case of English CI requests, a more distinct decrease was recorded only in minimal face-threat contexts. Thus, CI strategy in Lithuanian requests seems to be less entrenched and more context dependent.

1.4. The direct (D) strategy is the second most common request strategy, but the Lithuanians employed it much more frequently both in general (LT – 26.9 %, ENG – 10.9 %) and in individual situations that were provided in the questionnaire.

1.5. Canonical D requests forms in both Lithuanian and English requests are imperative mood constructions (LT – 79.5 %, ENG – 84.6 %). Explicit Lithuanian requests with performative verbs which have enjoyed the most scientific attention so far, appeared to be very rare (LT – 4.7 %) and limited solely to formal situations.

1.6. Despite the fact that D requests seem to be socially more acceptable to Lithuanians than to the English, the findings reveal that Lithuanian D requests make only around 1/4 of all answers and dominate merely in minimal face-threat situations. Therefore, contrary to what was maintained before, D requests could be said to

constitute a semantic center, but not a pragmatic center of the Lithuanian request paradigm.

1.7. There were very few instances of non-conventionally indirect (NCI) requests (LT – 6.6 %, ENG – 4.5 %). However, the Lithuanians have demonstrated a slightly larger preference for this strategy as well, and in most situations with higher numbers of D Lithuanian requests, more NCI requests were also observed. This means that the Lithuanian responses are spread wider along the directness-indirectness continuum. Lithuanians seem to be more flexible, more sensitive to the variation of contextual factors and make more use of the possibility to employ various directness levels when making a request.

1.8. In Lithuanian much more than English, requests can and in some instances even must be performed very directly. By employing less conventional indirectness, Lithuanians show less consideration for the negative face of H, i.e. his/her need for personal freedom and privacy. The Lithuanians don't find it as necessary to keep a distance, ask by expressing doubt in H's ability or willingness to comply with the request, and put more pressure on the latter to carry out the action. Notwithstanding, while being more direct, Lithuanians can be and are positively polite by presuming and conveying closeness, friendliness, as well as mutual duties and obligations. Being less egalitarian, the Lithuanians also find D requests, issued by a socially superior S to a lower status H, more acceptable and polite enough.

2. The illocutionary force of Lithuanian and English requests is richly mitigated by various additional internal grammatical modifiers (morphological and syntactical) (LT – 56.5 %, ENG – 62.3 %) and lexical, phrasal modifiers (LT – 57.2 %, ENG – 78.7 %<sup>1</sup>) within a head act. The amounts of these modifications in particular situations seem to positively correlate with the size of the face-threat in them.

2.1. Although the overall amount of morphological and syntactical modifications used by Lithuanians and the English differs by less than 6 %, the respondents have shown a clear predisposition to different groups of them, the main distinction being the structural complexity of the means of modification.

---

<sup>1</sup> Here and further, the percentages of the modified speech acts are presented.

2.2. Relatively simple subjunctive mood constructions were found to firmly dominate in both Lithuanian and English answers. However, in Lithuanian requests they appeared to be even more frequent, and constituted the biggest majority of all Lithuanian grammatical request modifications.

2.3. The findings show convincingly that morphological means are quite sufficient in softening Lithuanian requests grammatically. The Lithuanian utterances that were elicited are substantially less syntactically elaborated than those in English. Both positive and negative subjunctive mood constructions were very widely used in Lithuanian, as well as Lithuanian verb's second person plural forms, but unlike in the English requests, fewer structurally complex combinations of conditionals and morphological modifiers were employed.

2.4. As in the case of conventional indirectness, elaborate request structures show that S avoids imposing on H, tries to be careful when making a request, detach himself/herself from what is said, to show that a positive reaction of H is not too much expected, and by doing so (s)he not only protects H's negative case, but also takes care of his/her own face, supposing the request is really denied. The fact that the Lithuanians do not appear to have such a large need to structurally elaborate their requests also suggests them to be more positive politeness oriented than the English.

2.5. Speaking about the internal lexical and phrasal modifications, Lithuanian respondents favoured them more than 20 % less than the English.

2.6. In Lithuanian requests, the group of lexical hedges was found to be the most numerous, although the majority of cases in it were the question words *gal*, *galbūt*. In the answers provided by the English, complex desemantized introductory formulas were dominant, together with the formal requestive marker *please*.

2.7. The findings of the investigation make it possible to argue that formal requestive markers are not as important in Lithuanian requests. The Lithuanians make their requests polite enough with the help of understators, appealers, and diminutives. In natural speech, a friendly intonation, as well as appropriate paralinguistic and non-verbal signals, play a very important role here.

2.8. Extensive structural and semantic elaboration, and formal conventionalized lexical and phrasal modifiers are far less characteristic of Lithuanian requests than those in English, where all these means also tend to have a cumulative effect. Lithuanians



appear to be more inclined to use free-ranging positively polite internal request modifications than the English.

3. The illocutionary force of the Lithuanian and English requests was also modulated (mostly mitigated, but in separate cases aggravated) by external modifiers – supportive moves (LT – 64.1 %, ENG – 64.6 %). Their amounts were also noticed to positively correlate with the size of the face-threat in a particular situation.

3.1. The most numerous group of external request modifications in both Lithuanian and English requests were grounders or reasons and various suggestions and promises to H.

3.2. According to the results of the investigation, Lithuanians are even more likely to make suggestions and promises than the English, especially those of reward. It is also more common for Lithuanians to prepare H for the speech act by direct preparatory statements, whereas apologies, acknowledgements of impediment and unfavourable circumstances for carrying out the request, offers of a way out for H were much less frequent than in the answers provided by the English.

3.4. It is not only much more common for Lithuanians to notice H, to count on his/her kindness, make jokes, use irony, but also more acceptable to apparently pressure H by softer or harsher request aggravating moves.

3.5. The results provide a reason to state that when making a request, Lithuanians try to be more friendly versus respectfully attentive to H than the English, which also supports the claim that the Lithuanians are more positive politeness oriented than the English.

4. The identified differences between the Lithuanian and English requests can be explained by the inclination of the Lithuanians and the English to respectively positive and negative politeness. Neither of these two politeness types is superior to the other. The abundance of negatively polite request mitigating means, characteristic of English requests, is not only redundant, but even would be unacceptable for Lithuanians. Overall, Lithuanians do not see requests to be as face-threatening, since they do not seem to value the negative aspect of the face as much as the English. A universal need to mitigate requests is realized by different linguistic means in the studied languages, reflecting different cultural attitudes and beliefs of the cultural groups, e. g. concerning the other person, importance and limits of personal privacy, obligations and favours, acceptance

and display of social power differences, etc. It is namely culture that determines what kinds of ways to make a request are conventionalized in different languages and taken – within the same community, but not necessarily by outsiders – as an unquestionable norm.

# LIETUVIŲ IR ANGLŲ LINGVISTINIS MANDAGUMAS: PRAŠYMAI

## Santrauka

**Darbo naujumas ir aktualumas.** Šis darbas yra iš pragmatikos srities – lingvistinio mandagumo. Lingvistinio mandagumo tyrimų objektas – žmonėms sąveikaujant veikiantys jų tarpusavio santykių palaikymo kalba mechanizmai. Pasirodžius kertinei Brown ir Levinsono (1987 [1978]) mandagumo teorijai, susidomėjimas lingvistiniu mandagumu nepaprastai išaugo: per pastaruosius tris dešimtmečius atlikta gausybė empirinių įvairių kalbų tyrimų, o pastaraisiais metais pasirodė ir solidžių naujų teorinių veikalų.

Lietuvių kalbotyroje pati lingvistinė pragmatika tebėra nauja mokslo sritis. Pagal tyrimų tematiką ir objektą šio darbo autorei aktualiausios didesnės apimties publikacijos paskelbtos Čepaitienės (2007), Gudavičienės (2007), Zaikausko (2002), o pasirinktoji Brown ir Levinsono (1987) teorija taikyta Ryvitytės (2008) mokslo darbe.

Nors Lietuvoje yra paskelbta lietuvių kalbos praktikos reikalams skirtų, sociolingvistinių, etnolingvistinių kalbos etiketo tyrimų (pvz., Gudavičius 2000, Jasiūnaitė 1997, Kučinskaitė 1990 [1985]) mandagumu kaip pragmatiniu reiškiniu taip pat dar tik pradėdama domėtis. Reikšmingiausias specialiai įvairių šnekos aktų mandagumo klausimams skirtas veikalas – Čepaitienės „Lietuvių kalbos etiketas: semantika ir pragmatika“ (2007). Tačiau įvairūs šnekos aktai šiam darbui daugiausia rinkti iš įvairių tekstų ir tirti pradėdant nuo pasakymų formų, jų mandagumo funkciją ir socialinį vartojimo kontekstą dažniausiai atskleidžiant iš pačių pasakymų semantikos, o situacinis kontekstas bei jo įtaka daugeliu atvejų nėra žinoma ir nėra analizuojama.

Šioje disertacijoje pirmą kartą tiriami sakininės lietuvių kalbos prašymai ir jų mandagumas konkrečiose eksperimentinėse situacijose. Pasirinkta šnekos aktų tyrimo kryptis yra priešinga, nei taikyta iki šiol, – nuo funkcijos prie formos. Užtuot bandžius aprėpti lietuvių kalbos prašymų raiškos galimybes, susitelkiama prie jų vartosenos ir siekiama nustatyti dažniausius, kalbos vartotojams priimtinausius – taigi, manytina, ir mandagius – būdus lietuviškai prašyti skirtingomis socialinėmis aplinkybėmis. Drauge tai ir pirmasis lietuviškas tarpkultūrinės pragmatikos darbas, nes lietuvių prašymai gretinami su lygiai tokiomis pačiomis sąlygomis gauta britų anglų kalbos medžiaga.

Autorės ne tik atliekama lingvistinė šnekos aktų analizė, bet ir pateikiama sociokultūrinių išvalgų apie lietuvių etosą – mūsų prašymų raišką lemiančias mandagumo normas ir jas veikiančias kultūrinės nuostatas bei vertybes.

**Darbo objektas.** Tyrimui pasirinkta viena direktyvų grupė – prašymai:

- prašymai yra labai dažni ir svarbūs įvairiose kasdienio gyvenimo situacijose;
- ko nors prašydamas, adresantas daugiau ar mažiau apsunkina adresatą, todėl norėdamas pasiekti savo komunikacinį tikslą, bet kartu ir nepakenkti tarpusavio santykiams, turi imtis mandagumo priemonių;
- prašymai yra labai jautrūs socialiniam, kultūriniam, situaciniam kontekstui. Mokslininkų pastebėta, kad esama didelių prašymų gramatinių konstrukcijų, semantinių formulių ir jų vartosenos dažnumo įvairavimų, atspindinčių skirtingas įvairių kalbinių bei kultūrinių bendruomenių mandagumo normas;
- tarpkultūrinėje komunikacijoje aptariamų šnekos aktų realizacijos skirtumai sukelia nemažai nesklandumų, prisideda prie stereotipų apie „mandagias“ ir „nemandagias“ tautas formavimosi;
- skirtingų kalbų prašymų šnekos aktams ir jų mandagumui, ypač tarpkultūriniu aspektu, įvairių šalių pragmatikų skiriamas labai didelis dėmesys, tačiau lietuvių prašymai pakankamo mokslinio dėmesio dar nėra sulaukę.

Tai, kas komunikacijos procese laikoma normalu ir logiška, iš tiesų gali būti kalbiškai ir kultūriškai savita. Todėl lietuvių prašymus nuspręsta tirti drauge su kurios nors kultūriškai mums ne itin artimos tautos kalbos duomenimis – atliktas darbas yra gretinamasis. Britų anglų kalbos pasirinkimą pirmiausia lėmė tai, kad ji lingvistinio mandagumo aspektu yra bene geriausiai ištirta. Tai buvo patikimas atspirties taškas, gera atrama darbui su lietuvių kalbos duomenimis. Anglų kalba pasirinkta ir daugumoje kitų panašių tyrimų. Tačiau nei ši, nei jokia kita kalba negali būti laikoma mandagumo standartu, pagal kurį matuojamos kitos – kiekviena kalbinė ir kultūrinė bendruomenė gali būti mandagi savaip, o gretinamųjų tyrimų tikslas yra tuos savitumus atskleisti ir paaiškinti. Šiame darbe labiausiai susitelkiama prie pragmatiškai dar mažai tirtų lietuviškų prašymų.

**Darbo tikslas** – ištirti identiškose eksperimentinėse situacijose gautų lietuvių ir anglų prašymų mandagumo strategijas bei jų realizacijas, atsižvelgiant į socialinius ir situacinius konteksto kintamuosius; nustatyti ir paaiškinti lietuvių ir anglų prašymų

panašumus bei skirtumus, jų branduolių ir papildomų elementų vartosenos dažnumą bei įprastumą. Išsikelti tokie **uždaviniai**:

1. Atlikti prašymų strategijų – modelių pagal pasakymų tiesiogiškumo laipsnį – bei jų tipų analizę; atskleisti pagrindinių konteksto kintamųjų (socialinio nuotolio, socialinės galios, prašymo dydžio) įtaką prašymo strategijos pasirinkimui.
2. Ištirti papildomas vidines morfologines, sintaksines, leksines ir frazines prašymų branduolių modifikacijas.
3. Išanalizuoti išorines prašymų branduolių modifikacijas – artimiausiame lingvistiniame prašymo branduolio kontekste vartojamus ir jų paremiančius papildomus semantinius komponentus, sudarančius išplėstinį prašymo aktą, arba prašymą kaip pasakymų seką.
4. Užfiksuotus lietuviškų ir anglišių prašymų skirtumus pabandyti paaiškinti kultūriniu lietuvių ir anglų polinkiu į skirtingus mandagumo tipus: atitinkamai pozityviojo (kontaktinio), susijusio su artumo, solidarumo ir pan. raiška, ir negatyviojo (distancinio), kuriuo žymimas atstumas, reiškiamą pagarba ir pan. (Brown, Levinson 1987)

**Tiriamoji medžiaga ir tyrimo metodika.** Duomenys tyrimui gauti diskurso kūrimo testu (*discourse completion test*) – atvirąja anketa, kurioje respondentams buvo pateikta prašyti skatinančių situacijų scenarijai. Tyrimo dalyviai buvo aukštųjų mokyklų studentai, todėl apsiribota jiems įprasta aplinka – daugiausia universiteto ir namų. Scenarijų autentiškumas aptartas su potencialiais respondentais ir patikrintas per bandomąjį tyrimą.

Nors diskurso kūrimo testu surinkta medžiaga neatspindi daugybės natūralios šnekos ypatybių (Hikel 1997, Kasper 2000, Márquez Reiter 2000, Rintell & Mitchell 1989, Van Mulken 1996, Weizman 1989), šis metodas leidžia užčiuopti normas – ką kalbos vartotojai laiko tinkamu lingvistiniu elgesiu vienomis ar kitomis aplinkybėmis, atskleidžia kultūrinės jų vertybes (Beebe & Cummings 1996, Byon 2006, Billmyer & Varghese 2000, Marti 2005, Ogiermann 2009, Rose 1992, Yuan 2001). Lietuviškų šnekos aktų tyrimams svarbu tai, kad šis metodas leido taikyti funkcinę, o ne formaliąją prieigą prie duomenų, t. y. užduoti respondentams rūpimą komunikacinę intenciją ir tik

tada žiūrėti jos realizacijos būdų, o ne pagal surinktų pasakymų formas daryti prielaidą, kad tai yra prašymai.

Anketos situacijos kurtos atsižvelgiant į tris kontekstinius kintamuosius, kurie darbe apsibrėžti taip:

– **socialinis nuotolis** (*social distance*) – komunikantų artimumo laipsnis, t. y. kiek jie psichologiškai, emociškai susiję;

– **galios skirtumas** (*power distance*) – kiek adresantas pagal savo atliekamą socialinį vaidmenį, turimą statusą turi teisę veikti adresato elgesį;

– **prašymo dydis** (*size of request*) – kiek adresatas yra fiziškai ar psichologiškai apsunkinamas, kiek pagrįstai iš jo reikalaujama tam tikro veiksmo. Tai priklauso ne tik nuo paties prašomo dalyko, bet apima ir pašnekovų teises bei pareigas, pageidavimo įprastumą konkrečioje situacijoje.

Socialinis nuotolis tarp komunikantų ir prašymas gali būti dideli (+SN, +PD) arba maži (–SN, –PD), o galios požiūriu prašantysis gali būti viršesnis už adresatą ( $Pr > A$ ), žemesnis ( $Pr < A$ ) arba komunikantai gali būti lygūs ( $Pr = A$ ). Nusistatęs šių kintamųjų dydžius, adresantas įvertina planuojamo šnekos akto grėsmę įvaizdžiui: kuo adresatas turi daugiau galios, kuo didesnis socialinis nuotolis ir prašymas, tuo šnekos aktas rizikingesnis.

Į anketos situacijas įtraukti visi įmanomi kintamųjų variantų deriniai. Vienam deriniui skirta viena situacija, taigi iš viso sukurta 12 scenarijų. Jie glaustai pristatomi 1 lentelėje.

1 lentelė. Situacijos, kontekstinių kintamųjų kombinacijos ir prašymų grėsmė įvaizdžiui

Sutrumpinti scenarijų aprašai ir kodiniai jų pavadinimai	Socialinis nuotolis	Socialinė galia	Prašymo dydis	Grėsmė įvaizdžiui
1. Studentas (-ė) prašo draugo paduoti jam žurnalą <i>1S–Žurnalas</i>	–SN	Pr=A	–PD	–GĮ
2. Auditorijoje profesorė prašo studento (-ės) uždaryti langą <i>2S–Langas</i>	+SN	Pr>A	–PD	–GĮ
3. Studentas (-ė) prašo kurso draugės priimti pagyventi savo draugę <i>3S–Draugė</i>	–SN	Pr=A	+PD	+GĮ
4. Studentas (-ė) prašo studentės pasislinkti prie stalo valgykloje <i>4S–Valgykla</i>	+SN	Pr=A	–PD	–GĮ
5. Dėstytojas prašo studento (-ės) paankstinti pranešimo pristatymą <i>5S–Pranešimas</i>	+SN	Pr>A	+PD	+GĮ

6. Studentas (-ė) prašo kaimyno studento patylinti garsią muziką <i>6S–Muzika</i>	+SN	Pr=A	+PD	+GĮ
7. Mama prašo besimokančio sūnaus nueiti į parduotuvę <i>7S–Parduotuvė</i>	–SN	Pr>A	+PD	+GĮ
8. Studentas (-ė) prašo dėdės sodybos semestro pabaigos vakarėliui <i>8S–Sodyba</i>	–SN	Pr<A	+PD	+GĮ
9. Studentas (-ė) prašo žaidžiančios sesutės, kad pakeltų ragelį <i>9S–Telefonas</i>	–SN	Pr>A	–PD	–GĮ
10. Studentas (-ė) prašo dėstytojos pratęsti rašto darbo terminą <i>10S–Referatas</i>	+SN	Pr<A	+PD	+GĮ
11. Studentas (-ė) prašo katedros sekretorės popieriaus lapo <i>11S–Popierius</i>	+SN	Pr<A	–PD	–GĮ
12. Studentas (-ė) prašo gydytojo (šeimos draugo) siuntimo tyrimui <i>12S–Siuntimas</i>	–SN	Pr<A	–PD	–GĮ

+SN – socialinis nuotolis didelis, –SN – mažas.

Pr>A – prašantysis viršesnis už adresatą, Pr<A – žemesnis, Pr=A – komunikantai lygūs.

+PD – prašymas didelis, –PD – prašymas mažas.

+GĮ – prašymo grėsmė (nustatoma pagal kontekstinių kintamųjų vertes) įvaizdžiui didelė, –GĮ – maža.

Apklausa atlikta 2008-ųjų balandžio–birželio mėnesiais Lietuvoje ir Anglijoje. Dauguma apklaustų lietuvių mokėsi Vilniaus universitete, dauguma anglų – Halo universitete. Respondentai buvo įvairiausių, bet ne filologinių specialybių studentai. Nenorint iškreipti rezultatų, tiriamiesiems nebuvo nurodytas nei konkretus atliekamo tyrimo objektas, nei gretinamasis jo pobūdis. Pabrėžta kuo spontaniškesnių, kuo panašesnių į natūralią šneką atsakymų svarba. Anketas užpildė 130 lietuvių ir 140 anglų, tačiau į tyrimą įtrauktos tik iki galo užpildytos anketos ir tik tų respondentų, kurie yra gimę Lietuvoje ir Anglijoje, kuriems lietuvių ir anglų kalbos yra gimtosios ir kurie pagal tautybę priskyrė save vienai arba kitai grupei. Be to, atsitiktine tvarka atmetus dalį gautos medžiagos, sulyginas kiekvienos grupės vyrų ir moterų skaičius. Iš viso analizuoti 100 lietuviškų ir 100 anglišku anketų duomenys.

Medžiagos klasifikacijai ir analizei pritaikyta Tarpkultūrinio šnekos aktų realizacijos projekto (Blum-Kulka ir kt. 1989) mokslininkų ištobulinta sistema, sukurta prašymui kaip pasakymų sekai, išplėstiniam prašymui tirti. Išplėstinį prašymą sudaro jo branduolys – pagrindinis prašymo aktas, vidinės (gramatinės, leksinės, frazinės) ir išorinės modifikacijos, t. y. papildomi išoriniai, ji paremiantys semantiniai komponentai. Darbe taikyti ir kiekybiniai, ir kokybiniai metodai.

## **Ginamieji teiginiai**

1. Dominuojanti lietuvių ir anglų prašymų strategija – konvencionaliai netiesioginė (KN). Tačiau lietuviai ją taiko rečiau nei anglai. KN prašymų strategija abiejose kalbose dažniausiai realizuojama kvestionuojant adresato gebėjimą atlikti nurodomą veiksmą.
2. Lietuviai dažniau ir įvairesnėse situacijose nei anglai taiko tiesioginę (T) prašymų strategiją. Tačiau T lietuviški prašymai vyrauja tik minimalios grėsmės įvaizdžiu – visai nerizikingose prašymų situacijose. T abiejų kalbų prašymai dažniausiai reiškiami liepiamosios nuosakos konstrukcijomis.
3. Lietuviai vartoja daugiau vidinių morfologinių prašymų modifikacijų, bet mažiau ir paprastesnių sintaksinių jų modifikavimo priemonių.
4. Lietuviai kur kas rečiau nei anglai savo prašymus modifikuoja leksinėmis priemonėmis, ypač tam tikrais įterptiniais žodžiais ir įvairiomis sustabarėjusiomis įžanginėmis formuluotėmis.
5. Lietuviams ir anglams beveik vienodai įprastos įvairios išorinės prašymų modifikacijos, bet konkrečių jų grupių populiarumas skiriasi.
6. Lyginant su negatyviojo mandagumo anglų kultūra, lietuviai yra labiau linkę į pozityvųjį mandagumą. Lietuviškuose prašymuose atsispindi mažiau dėmesio adresato laisvei bei privatumui, mažiau atsargaus pesimizmo, daugiau tikėjimo atliekamo šnekos akto sėkme ir pan. Tačiau lietuviai savo prašymams mandagumo suteikia perteikdami artumą, atsiremdami į savaime suprantamus žmonių įsipareigojimus vieni kitiems, kurdami šiltą bendravimo atmosferą ir pan.
7. Skirtingi būdai, kuriais lietuviams ir anglams prašant yra priimta atsižvelgti į adresatą, yra nulemti skirtingų kultūrinių jų vertybių, požiūrių bei nuostatų.

**Darbo struktūra.** Disertaciją sudaro įvadas, trys pagrindinės dalys, bendrosios išvados, literatūros sąrašas ir priedas. Įvade aptariamas darbo naujumas ir aktualumas, pristatomas tyrimo objektas, išsikeltas tikslas, uždaviniai ir kt., suformuluojami ginamieji teiginiai.

Pirmojoje dalyje svarstomi bendrieji teoriniai lingvistinio mandagumo ir konkrečiai – prašymų mandagumo klausimai. Pirmame šios dalies skyriuje kalbama apie sociokultūrinį mandagumo reiškinių pobūdį, atskleidžiami kalbos etiketo ir pragmatinės



lingvistinio mandagumo sąvokų skirtumai, apžvelgiami svarbiausi tradiciniai ir postmoderniųjų tyrėjų požiūriai į lingvistinį mandagumą, argumentuojamas teorinio darbo pagrindo pasirinkimas. Antrame skyriuje apsibrėžiamas tyrimo objektas, pristatomos pagrindinės prašymų strategijos, aptariamas pasakymų tiesiogiškumo ir jų mandagumo ryšys, pabrėžiamas kultūrinis prašymų šnekos aktų savitumas, apžvelgiami svarbiausi užsienyje ir Lietuvoje atlikti empiriniai prašymų tyrimai.

Antroji dalis skirta tyrimo metodikos klausimams. Joje pagrindžiamas DKT metodo pasirinkimas, aprašoma naudota anketa, tiriamųjų imtis, tyrimo procedūra, pateikiama medžiagos klasifikacijos bei analizės sistema.

Trečiojoje dalyje atliekama gretinamoji gautų duomenų analizė šiais aspektais: pagrindinio prašymo akto strategijų (tiesioginė (T), konvencionaliai netiesioginė (KN), nekonvencionaliai netiesioginė (NN) bei nepateiktų prašymų atvejai) ir jų tipų, vidinių (morfologinių, sintaksinių, leksinių, frazinių) ir išorinių prašymų modifikacijų. Kiekvienas iš trijų šios dalies skyrių pabaigoje apibendrinamas ir padaromos išvados.

Disertacijos gale pateikiamos bendrosios išvados, naudotos literatūros sąrašas (143 pozicijos) ir priedas, kuriame įdėti lietuviškas ir angliškas apklausos anketos variantai. Tyrimo rezultatai apibendrinami 1 schemeje, 9 lentelėse ir 8 paveiksluose.

## **Išvados**

Išanalizavus identiškuose eksperimentiniuose kontekstuose gautus sakininės lietuvių ir anglų kalbos prašymų duomenis, susisteminius tyrimo rezultatus, galima padaryti tokias išvadas:

1. Lietuvių ir anglų prašymų strategijų pasirinkimai yra valdomi bendrų sociopragmatinių ir mandagumo principų, tačiau nustatyta ir statistiškai reikšmingų skirtumų.

1.1. Gauti rezultatai rodo, kad pati dažniausia lietuvių ir anglų prašymų strategija – konvencionaliai netiesioginė (KN) (LT – 64,0 %, ANG – 81,7 %). Tai dera su daugybės kitų tyrimų rezultatais, kuriais KN strategija nustatyta kaip universaliausia įvairių kalbų prašymuose.

1.2. Didžioji dauguma gautų KN abiejų kalbų prašymų yra netiesioginiai klausimai apie parengiamąją veiksmo galimybės sąlygą (LT – 90,1 %, ANG – 72,8 %). Tačiau ši sąlyga dažniau kvestionuota lietuvių, kurie savo ruožtu rečiau prašė

teiraudamiesi apie gana subjektyvią adresato noro, pasirengimo atlikti nurodomą veiksmą sąlygą (LT – 9,8, ANG – 20,7 %).

1.3. Lietuviškų KN prašymų gauta 20 % mažiau nei anglišių. Jų skaičius daug mažesnis įvaizdžiui ne tokiose grėsmingose, ne tokiose rizikingose prašymų situacijose, kai esama mažo socialinio nuotolio ir / arba adresanto padėties viršenybės. O pastebimai mažesnis anglų KN prašymų skaičius užfiksuotas tik išvis minimalios grėsmės įvaizdžiui kontekstuose. Taigi KN strategija lietuvių prašymuose nėra tokia įprasta kaip anglų, labiau priklauso nuo bendravimo aplinkybių: socialinių komunikantų vaidmenų ir paties prašymo turinio.

1.4. Tiesioginė (T) strategija yra antra pagal dažnumą, tačiau lietuviškų T prašymų pavartota daugiau tiek apskritai (LT – 26,9 %, ANG – 10,9 %), tiek kalbant apie atskiras anketos situacijas.

1.5. Tiek lietuvių, tiek anglų T prašymai dažniausiai reikšti liepiamosios nuosakos konstrukcijomis (LT – 79,5 %, ANG – 84,6 %). Lietuviški eksplicitiniai performatyvai, kuriems iki šiol skirta daugiausia mokslininkų dėmesio kaip pačiam įprasčiausiam būdui lietuviškai prašyti, pasirodė esą labai reti (tik 4,7 % visų T prašymų) ir vartojami tik oficialesnėse situacijose.

1.6. Nors prašyti tiesiogiai lietuviams buvo kone triskart priimtinau nei anglams, gauti skaičiai atskleidžia, kad T lietuviški prašymai sudaro apie ketvirtadalį visų pateiktų pasakymų ir dominuoja tik mažos grėsmės įvaizdžiui situacijose. Tai leidžia teigti, kad, kitaip nei manyta iki šiol, T prašymai sudaro semantinį, bet ne pragmatinį lietuviško prašymo paradigmos centrą.

1.7. Nekonvencionaliai netiesioginių (NN) prašymų gauta labai nedaug (LT – 6,6 %, ANG – 4,5 %). Tačiau lietuviai respondentai buvo kiek labiau linkę ir į šią strategiją. Be to, daugumoje situacijų, kuriose gauta didesni T prašymų skaičiai, pavartota ir daugiau NN prašymų. Vadinasi, lietuvių prašymai tiesiogiškumo-netiesiogiškumo skalėje išsidėsto plačiau nei anglų. Lietuviai prašydami yra lankstesni, labiau atsižvelgia į kontekstinių kintamųjų variacijas ir labiau išnaudoja galimybę savo šnekos aktus pateikti įvairių tiesiogiškumo lygių.

1.8. Atlikto tyrimo rezultatai leidžia teigti, kad lietuviai kur kas dažniau nei anglai gali, o tam tikrais atvejais – netgi turi prašyti labai tiesiogiai. Tai, kad jų rečiau taikoma KN strategija, rodo, jog lietuviai negatyviajam adresato įvaizdžiui – jo laisvės ir

privatumo troškimui – išreiškia mažiau dėmesio. Lietuviams adresantams nėra taip svarbu išlaikyti pagarbų nuotolį, prašyti išreiškiant abejonę adresato galėjimu ar noru patenkinti prašymą, adresatas labiau spaudžiamas paklusti. Tačiau nors lietuviai ir nevengia prašyti tiesiogiai, jie gali būti ir yra mandagūs perteikdami artumą, draugiškumą, numanydami tarp komunikantų esant glaudžius tarpusavio ryšius, kurie įvairias paslaugas vienas kitam daro savaime suprantamas. Didesnio galios skirtumo, mažiau egalitariškoje lietuvių kultūroje priimtinesni ir pakankamai mandagūs yra ir T socialiai viršesnio adresanto žemesniam adresatui skirti prašymai.

2. Lietuviškų ir anglišku prašymų ilokucinė galia ir jų poveikis adresatui gausiai švelninti papildomomis vidinėmis šnekos akto branduolio modifikacijomis: gramatinėmis (morfologinėmis, sintaksinėmis) (modifikuota LT – 56,5 %, ENG – 62,3 % visų branduolių) ir leksinėmis bei frazinėmis (modifikuota LT – 57,2 %, ENG – 78,7 % visų branduolių) priemonėmis. Pastebėtas teigiamos koreliacijos ryšys tarp modifikacijų skaičiaus ir grėsmės įvaizdžiui dydžio prašymų situacijose.

2.1. Nors bendras lietuvių ir anglų vartotų morfologinių bei sintaksinių modifikacijų skaičius skiriasi labai nedaug (mažiau nei 6 %), respondentai buvo labai aiškiai linkę į skirtingas jų grupes. Pagrindinis skirtumas – pasitelktų modifikavimo priemonių sudėtingumas.

2.2. Tiek lietuvių, tiek anglų prašymuose labai aiškiai vyravo palyginti paprastos tariamosios nuosakos konstrukcijos. Vis dėlto lietuvių prašymuose šių konstrukcijų buvo dar daugiau nei anglų ir čia jos sudarė didžiąją visų vartotų gramatinių modifikacijų dalį.

2.3. Gauti duomenys rodo, kad kalbant apie gramatines modifikacijas, lietuvių prašymams visai pakanka morfologinių modifikavimo priemonių. Lietuviškuose prašymuose rasta daugiau ne tik teigiamų, bet ir neigiamų tariamosios nuosakos konstrukcijų. Savo prašymams švelninti lietuviai išnaudoja turimas veiksmažodžių kaitybos asmenimis galimybes, tačiau, kitaip nei anglai, pasitelkia kur kas mažiau sudėtinių prijungiamųjų sakinių konstrukcijų, o ypač – dar labiau išplėtotų sudėtinių sakinių ir įvairių morfologinių modifikacijų derinių.

2.4. Panašiai kaip ir KN prašymų atveju, struktūriškai sudėtingi prašymai rodo, kad adresantas vengia apsunkinti adresatą, stengiasi pateikti pageidavimą kuo atsargiau, atsiriboti nuo to, kas sakoma, parodyti, kad teigiamos reakcijos per daug nesitiki, ir taip ne tik apsaugoti negatyvųjį komunikanto įvaizdį, bet ir pats apsidrausti nuo galimos

prašymo nesėkmės. Taigi tai, kad lietuviams neatrodo būtina tiek gramatiškai išplėtoti savo prašymų branduolių kiek anglams, taip pat liudija didesnę lietuvių polinkį į kitą – pozityviojo mandagumo tipą.

2.5. Vidinių leksinių bei frazinių prašymų modifikacijų lietuviai respondentai pavartojo 20 % mažiau. Patys populiariausi ir kur kas dažnesni nei anglų prašymuose buvo sąšvelniai (išlygos). Tačiau didžiąją daugumą šioje grupėje sudaro abejojamosios dalelytės *gal, galbūt*, o anglai sąšvelnių vartojo mažiau, bet įvairių. Anglų prašymuose dominavo lietuviškiems mažai būdingos sudėtingos desemantizuotos įžanginės formuluotės.

2.6. Lietuviški prašymo žymekliai *prašom, prašau, prašyčiau* vartoti kone dešimt kartų rečiau nei angliškas *please*, kuris buvo antra pagal dažnumą anglų prašymų modifikacija. Šie formalūs lietuviški žodžiai dažniausiai vartoti ne performatyviai, prieš veiksmazodžio bendratį, o kaip liepiamosios nuosakos konstrukcijų įterpiniai arba pridūriniai, nors ir tokių jų vartojimo atvejų užfiksuota nedaug. Turimi duomenys duoda pagrindą tvirtinti, kad prašydami artimų žmonių lietuviai dažniausiai apsieina be formalių prašymų mandagumo žymeklių.

2.7. Tyrimas atskleidė, kad lietuviškus prašymus pakankamai sušvelnina pridurtiniai adresato sutikimo siekiantys žodeliai, deminutyvai, tikri arba tariami prašomojo dalyko sumenkinimai. Gyvojoje sakytinėje kalboje čia labai svarbų vaidmenį atlieka draugiška, maloni intonacija, kūno kalba.

2.8. Lyginant su gauta angliška medžiaga, lietuvių prašymams daug mažiau būdingos negatyviai mandagios sudėtingos sintaksinės ir sustabarėjusios semantinės struktūros, formalūs leksiniai bei fraziniai mandagumo ženklai, o ypač – angliškuose prašymuose pastebėta visų šių priemonių akumuliacija viename šnekos akte. Lietuvių labiau linkstama į ne tokios apibrėžtos aprėpties pozityvųjų mandagumą perteikiančias vidines prašymų modifikacijas.

3. Lietuvių ir anglų prašymų branduoliai gausiai modifikuoti ir išoriškai (modifikuota LT – 64,1 %, ANG – 64,6 % visų branduolių). Išorinių modifikacijų skaičius atskirose situacijose taip pat koreliuoja su prašymo grėsme įvaizdžiu.

3.1. Bendra dažniausia išorinė modifikacija – prašymo pagrindimai, paaiškinimai. Po jų rikiuojasi įvairūs pažadai bei pasiūlymai adresatui.

3.2. Gauti duomenys rodo, kad lietuviai žadėti ir siūlyti (ypač atsilyginti), pabrėžiant abipusiškumą tarp komunikantų, linkę dar labiau nei anglai. Lietuviams taip pat įprasčiau rengti adresatą prašymui konstatuojant, kad esama kokios nors problemos, numanant, kad adresatui rūpi adresanto gerovė, kad jis nori ir yra pasirengęs padėti ją spręsti.

3.3. Prašydami lietuviai respondentai mažiau eksplicitiškai atsiprašinėjo, jiems buvo ne taip įprasta išreikšti supratimą, kad adresatui gali būti sunku patenkinti pageidavimą, adresatui rečiau atvirai siūlyta galimybė atmesti prašymą ir pastarasis rečiau tikintas, kad toks sprendimas būtų visiškai suprantamas.

3.4. Lietuviai dažniau reiškė susidomėjimą pačiu adresatu, jo gerove, emociingiau ar santūriau apeliavo į adresato gerumą, juokavo, draugiškai ironizavo. Tačiau komunikacinio savo tikslo lietuviai adresantai kur kas dažniau siekė ir vartodami švelnesnius ar grubesnius prašymo ilokucinės galios stiprikius. Gauti prašymų duomenys rodo, kad lietuviams labiau nei anglams būdinga atvira tiek teigiamų, tiek neigiamų emocijų raiška.

3.5. Skirtingų išorinių modifikacijų grupių priemonių pasirinkimo skirtumai taip pat atskleidžia didesnę lietuvių polinkį į pozityvųjį mandagumą: lyginant su anglais, lietuviai respondentai rodė daugiau draugiško, o ne pagarbaus dėmesio adresatui (anglų dažnai reiškiamo trafaretinėmis frazėmis), labiau pasikliovė bendru komunikantų bendravimo pagrindu.

4. Nustatytas gretintų kalbų prašymų raiškos skirtynes tikrai galima paaikškinti didesne anglų orientacija į negatyviojo, o lietuvių – į pozityviojo mandagumo tipą. Nė viena iš šių mandagumo sistemų nėra pranašesnė už kitą. Anglų prašymams būdinga negatyviojo mandagumo priemonių gausa lietuviams ne tik kad nereikalinga, bet ir būtų nepriimtina. Lietuviams prašymai neatrodo tokie grėsmingi negatyviajam įvaizdžiui, nes jam mūsų kultūroje skiriama mažesnė svarba. Universalus poreikis švelninti tirtus optatyvinius direktyvus tirtų kalbų ir kultūrų atstovų realizuojamas skirtingomis mandagumo priemonėmis, atspindinčiomis skirtingas kultūrinės jų vertybes bei nuostatas, susijusias su tuo, kaip suprantamas individas, kur brėžiamos asmens privatumo ribos, kiek lengvai žmonės yra vieni kitiems prieinami, kiek savaimė suprantamos jų vienas kitam teikiamos paslaugos, esami įsipareigojimai ir pan. Kaip tik

kultūra lemia, kokie būdai prašyti nusistovi ir tos pačios bendruomenės atstovams – bet nebūtinai svetimiesiems – tampa savaiame suprantama norma.

### **Articles on the dissertation topic in accredited periodicals:**

1. Mandagumas kaip reliatyvus kalbinis, socialinis ir kultūrinis reiškiny, *Acta Linguistica* 58, 2008, 1–15 p.
2. Lietuvių ir anglų prašymų strategijos ir mandagumas, *Lietuvių kalba*, 2009, 1–18 p.

### **Presentations made on the topic of the dissertation:**

1. „Mandagumas kaip reliatyvus kalbinis, socialinis ir kultūrinis reiškiny“, Respublikinė doktorantų konferencija „Naujausi humanitariniai tyrinėjimai“, 2007 m. balandžio 26 d.
2. „Kalbinis mandagumas ir kalbos etiketas – viena ir tas pat?“, Lietuvos socialinių mokslų forumo konferencija, 2007 m. gegužės 18–20 d.
3. „Lietuvių ir anglų prašymų strategijos ir mandagumas“, Taikomosios kalbotyros asociacijos susitikimas, 2009 m. kovo 6 d.
4. „Request strategies in Lithuanian and British English“, Tarptautinė jaunųjų lingvistų konferencija, Poznanės A. Mickevičiaus universitetas, 2009 m. balandžio 23–26 d.
5. „Uždaryk langą, gerai? ir *Would you mind closing the window please?*: lietuvių ir anglų prašymai“, Lietuvos socialinių mokslų forumo konferencija, 2009 m. gegužės 22–24 d.

## About the author

Inga Hilbig (1979) graduated from Vilnius University in 2003 with an M.A. in Lithuanian Linguistics. In 2004 she was accepted as a doctoral candidate of Applied Linguistics in the Department of Lithuanian Studies at the University of Vilnius.

During her doctoral studies (2004–2009) she published two articles and gave five presentations on the topic of her dissertation. In January-June 2008 she was a part-time student at the University of Hull (Great Britain). She took part in the 4th International Politeness Symposium (Budapest, July, 2008), and is a member of the Linguistic Politeness Research Group.

Since 2002 Inga Hilbig has been working at the Department of Lithuanian Studies at Vilnius University. She has read lectures on teaching Lithuanian as a foreign language and Lithuanian socio-culture for local teachers of Lithuanian and the ones working abroad. She has taken part in scientific conferences, has published scientific articles, and is a member of the Lithuanian Applied Linguistics Association. Inga Hilbig has worked with the following projects: “Oneness“ (2003–2006) (an on-line course for less widely used and taught European languages) and “Kalbinių kompetencijų vertinimo ir įsivertinimo sistemos plėtra“ (2006–2008). She is a co-translator of the book “Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment“ (2008) and a co-author of a publication for learning Lithuanian entitled “Sveiki atvykę!“ (2008).

## Apie autorę

Inga Hilbig (g. 1979) 2003 m. baigė lietuvių kalbotyros magistrantūros studijas Vilniaus universitete. 2004 m. buvo priimta į VU Filologijos mokslo krypties Taikomosios kalbotyros doktorantūrą.

Doktorantūros studijų metais (2004–2009 m.) disertacijos tema paskelbė du mokslinius straipsnius, skaitė penkis pranešimus moksliniuose renginiuose Lietuvoje ir užsienyje. 2008 m. sausio–birželio mėnesiais buvo nuvykusi dalinių studijų į Halo universitetą (Didžioji Britanija). Dalyvavo Ketvirtajame tarptautiniame mandagumo simpoziume (2008 m. liepa, Budapeštas), yra *Linguistic Politeness Research Group* narė.

Nuo 2002 m. dirba VU Lituanistinių studijų katedroje asistente. Skaito paskaitas apie lietuvių kalbos kaip svetimosios ir lietuvių sociokultūros mokymą Lietuvos mokytojams ir užsienio lituanistikos centrų pedagogams, dalyvauja mokslinėse konferencijose, turi publikavusi mokslinių straipsnių. Yra Taikomosios kalbotyros asociacijos narė. Dalyvavo dviejuose projektuose: „Oneness“ (2003–2006) (nuotoliniai rečiau varotojamų ir rečiau vartojamų ir mokomų kalbų kursai internete) ir „Kalbinių kompetencijų vertinimo ir įsivertinimo sistemos plėtra“ (2006–2008). Kartu su katedros kolegėmis vertė „Bendruosius Europos kalbų mokymosi, mokymo ir vertinimo metmenis“ (2008), rengė lietuvių kalbos mokomąją priemonę „Sveiki atvykę“ (2008).