A study of Greek Native Speakers' (NSs') Requests in Informal Situations: Modern Greek Films Data Analysis & Language Teaching

Elisavet Mavromati University of Thessaly elsa.mavromati@gmail.com

Περίληψη

Στην εργασία αυτή εξετάζουμε τις επιλογές φυσικών ομιλητών της ελληνικής στη διατύπωση 150 αιτημάτων σε οικείες, μεταζύ των συνομιλητών, περιστάσεις, που αντλούμε από ταινίες του σύγχρονου ελληνικού κινηματογράφου. Θεωρητικό μας πλαίσιο αποτελεί η εκδοχή των Brown και Levinson (1978, 1987) για την ευγένεια. Με βασικό πρότυπο το μοντέλο των Blum-Kulka κ.ά. (1989), αναλύουμε τις στρατηγικές των κύριων πράζεων, την προοπτική, τις εσωτερικές τροποποιήσεις και ειδικότερα τους λεζικούς/φραστικούς μετριαστές και τα επιτατικά στοιχεία των κύριων πράζεων αλλά και των υποστηρικτικών κινήσεων. Τέλος, ακολουθώντας τη Martínez-Flor (2008) διατυπώνουμε ενδεικτική πρόταση διδακτικής αζιοποίησης των δεδομένων σε μαθητές της ελληνικής ως δεύτερης/ζένης γλώσσας.

Λέζεις- κλειδιά: ευγένεια, αιτήματα, Ελληνικά, τροποποιήσεις, ταινίες, διδασκαλία

1 Introduction

Interlanguage Pragmatics' research findings indicate the necessity of explicit instruction in speech acts and especially in informal situations, which are considered highly demanding, regarding the required level of sociopragmatic competence. Besides, since syllabi and materials of teaching the Greek as a second/foreign language usually focus on formal structures of politeness, learners find difficulties in performing and modifying their requests properly ($M\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ 2013). It is also indicated (Martínez-Flor 2008) that films seem to be a good source of pragmatic input, since they present performed speech acts in an appropriate context and offer a variety of their realizations. Thus they can help learners perform and modify properly their requests.

In this study, in the framework of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory model (1978, 1987), according to which requests are considered typical face-threatening acts, we explore the choices of Greek NSs performing 150 requests in a variety of informal situations, using data extracted from modern greek films.

We follow the classification presented in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) with some modifications. We explore the strategy types of head acts, their perspective, the internal modifications, focusing in the lexical and phrasal downgraders and in the upgraders, both of the head acts and also of the supportive moves. Our research is basically quantitative but also qualitative and includes in indicative examples an analysis of all the utterances involved in a request realization.

We discuss our results of the speakers' preferences found in our data, which are presented in a percentage scale, in respect to previous researches' results on Greek NSs' requests (Sifianou 1992, Economidou-Kogetsidis 2008, $M\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ 2013).

We finally propose some pedagogical implications, following Martínez-Flor (2008), for the integration of our analysed data in the instruction of the speech act of requesting in the Greek as a second/foreign language classroom.

This study was conducted in the framework of my master's thesis in the University of Athens, Greece (Μαυρομάτη 2011).

2 Theoretical Background - Definitions

A request is defined as:

"an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker. The act may be a request for *non -verbal* goods and services, i.e. a request for an object, an action or some kind of service, etc., or it can be a request for verbal goods and services, i.e. a request for information" (Trosborg 1995:187)

According to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory model (1978, 1987), requests are considered as typical face threatening acts (FTAs), primarily threatening addressee's negative face want. The notion of "face", defined as:

"the public self-image that every member [of a society] wants to claim for himself"

consists in two related aspects: a. negative face, which refers to his claim to freedom of action and freedom of imposition and b. positive face, which refers to his desire to be appreciated and approved of (1987:61). Participants, mutually interested in maintaining each other face, employ politeness strategies to minimize the threat. Furthermore, the assessment of the seriousness of an FTA involves three social variables: the social distance (D), the relative power (P) between participants and the absolute ranking of impositions (R) in each particular culture (1987:74).

3 Method

We chose for this analysis five modern Greek films (see Appendix) related to the genre types of drama, social, comedy and romantic. Following Martínez-Flor (2008), we chose modern films in order to have the best possible representation of realistic life and we avoided cartoons, musicals, period films and films made earlier than 1990s.

We watched all films in their entirety and identified different request situations. After watching each request situation repeatedly, we transcribed each one in its full conversational context. After having transcribed all the request situations, we proceeded with the classification.

3.1 Classification

We followed the classification presented in Blum-Kulka et al. (1989), after we slightly modified it, based on the more recent classification of Trosborg (1995) and on comments of Sifianou (1992).

According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989:17-19) *Head act* is the main requesting utterance which is formulated by employed strategies. Head acts are classified according to three levels of directness in three *strategy types*: a. direct strategies, b.

conventionally indirect strategies, c. non conventionally indirect strategies. Each level comprise categories of substrategies (see Table 1).

Head acts vary also on the *perspective*. Requests can be: speaker oriented (e.g (...) $\chi \rho \epsilon i \Delta \zeta o \mu \alpha i \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau \alpha [\Delta IAX]$ (...) I need money), hearer oriented (e.g. $E \sigma \delta \mu \pi o \rho \epsilon \delta \zeta v \alpha \mu \epsilon \beta o \eta \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \iota \varsigma; [\Delta IAX]$ Can you help me?), phrased as inclusive (e.g. $N \alpha \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \delta v o v \mu \epsilon v \alpha \pi \alpha \mu \epsilon$ (...) [MOXΩ] Let's make it to go) or as impersonal (e.g. $\Theta \alpha \chi \rho \epsilon \iota \alpha \sigma \tau o \delta v \kappa \iota \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau \alpha [\Delta IAX]$. Some more money will be needed).

Internal modifications are modifying elements basically linked to the head act (syntactic and lexical/phrasal downgraders or upgraders, which either soften or intensify the potential impact of the utterance on the hearer).

Supportive moves (external modification) are peripheral modifying elements that may precede or follow the request either mitigating, e.g. preparators, grounders (see examples in subsection 3.2) or aggravating, e.g. insults, its force.

Strategy type	Substrategies (SSTs)	Examples extracted from data
(ST)		
Direct strategies (DS)	1.Mood derivable Imperative	Φέρε κι ένα γάλα. [ΔΙΑΧ] And also bring some milk.
	1a Elliptical constructions ¹	()58.26 () [MOXΩ] ()58.26 () (i.e give me 58,26 euros)
	1b Statements of ability and willingness ²	Λοιπόν, σηκώνεσαι ζημερώματα και πας να δεις τι έχει κάνει ο Ρωμαίο [MΠΡΑ] Well, you get up at dawn and you go to see what Romeo has done
	2 Performative	Eγώ αυτό που ρωτάω είναι αν μπορείς να πάρεις στα κεντρικά να μου δώσουν αυτό το ρημάδι το χαρτί ()[MIIPA] What I am asking is you to call, if you can, to the central administration asking them to issue this wreck of document ()
	3.Hedged performative	() πρέπει να σου πω ότι θέλω ναχωρίσουμε.[MOXΩ] () I have to tell you that I want to break up with you.
	4. Obligation Statement	Θανάση, () πρέπει να βάλουμε μια τάζη εδώ μέσα ()[ΑΔΓΩ] Thanasis, () we have to tidy up a bit in here ()
Conventionally indirect strategies	5.Want / Desire / Need statement ³	Θέλω να πάμε κάπου, μια εκδρομή, κάτι. [ΔΙΑΧ]

¹ We considered elliptical constructions in the following cases discussed by Sifianou (1992: 152-155) functional equivalent to imperative: a. of verb missing like *bring, give* mainly in service encounters or in in-group encounters or in cases of emergency b. of noun object missing c. in which the performative verb "plead" $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega$ or the politeness marker *please* or even an address term are used alone or in combination.

² We considered these statements that Trosborg (1995: 200) refers to and explains as "structures, in which the hearer's ability/willingness is asserted" functional equivalent to imperative.

³ classified in CIS, following Trosborg (1995: 205)

(CIS)		I want us to go somewhere, an excursion, something <i>Άρη, χρειάζομαι χρήματα. ()</i> [ΔΙΑΧ] Aris,I need money. ()
	6. Permission request ⁴	Nα πιω λίγο απ΄αυτό; [ΔΙΑΧ] May I drink a little of this?
	7. Suggestory formulae	Δ εν τρώμε κανα φρούτο; [MOXΩ] (Why) don't we have some fruit?
	8. Preparatory ⁵	Λέω, μήπως μπορείς να βρεις ποιος είναι το αφεντικό τους. [MΠΡΑ] I wonder if you can find out who their boss is.
	8a. Query preparatory	Εσύ μπορείς να με βοηθήσεις; [ΔΙΑΧ] Can you help me?
Non conventionally indirect strategies (NCIS)	9. Strong hint	<i>Τώρα</i> πώς θα κάνω εγώ μπάνιο; (speaker's request for the listener to remove the pots he has placed in the bathtub) [ΔIAX] Now how do I take a bath?
	9a. Ellipsis (utterance incompleteness) ⁶	 <i>A</i>, η μανούλα σου; (speaker's request to persuade the listener to ask his mother for money) [ΔIAX] Oh, your mother-dim?
	10. Mild hint	<i>Τι κάνατε, όλη μέρα, ρε;</i> (speaker's request for the listener to arrange things) $[A\Delta\Gamma\Omega]$ What were you doing during all day (re)?

Table 1 | Head Acts Request Strategies

In this study we focused on the internal modification both of the head acts and also of the supportive moves. The lexical/phrasal modifiers of our data basically fall in the following categories:

Downgraders: politeness-familiarity (solidarity) markers ($\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\omega}$ /please- $\rho \varepsilon$ /re), understaters ($\lambda i \gamma o / \alpha$ little), hedges ($\kappa \dot{\alpha} \tau i / \text{something}$) subjectivizers ($\nu o \mu i \zeta \omega / I$ think), downtoners ($\mu \eta \pi \omega \varsigma / \text{if}$), cajolers ($\xi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \varepsilon i \varsigma / \gamma o u$ know), appealers ($\varepsilon \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \varepsilon i ; / \text{ok}$?) or the above in combination.

Upgraders: intensifiers ($\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon$ /come on), time intensifiers ($\tau\dot{\omega}\rho\alpha$ /now) repetition of request, emphatic additions or the above in combination.

3.2 An indicative example of request's parts analysis of our film data

Our research includes in indicative examples an analysis of all the utterances involved in a request, as in the following example, from a scene of the movie "Oxygen":

⁴ classified in CIS, following Trosborg (1995: 205)

⁵ Blum-Kulka et al. (1989:280)

⁶ We included in this subcategory the discussed by Sifianou (1992:155) type of ellipsis involving utterance incompleteness that enables the addressee who is not actually requested to decide how to react.

[*Chris, a young man, talks with Fey, his little niece's ballet teacher, with whom he is supposed to have an affair*]

Φαίη: Θά' χεις αυτοκίνητο;Fey: Will you have the car? *Χρήστος: Όχι, έχω τη μηχανή* Chris: No, I have the motorbike. Φαίη: Θα με πετάζεις μέχρι το σπίτι, γιατί το έχω (:το αυτοκίνητο) στοσυνεργείο;Fey: Will you give me a ride home, because I took it (:*the car*) to agarage?

[We watch Chris with Fey and his niece on the motorbike]

The head act of this request is performed by an indirect strategy, the query preparatory, formed by the structure $\theta \alpha$ (will) + future indicative.

Θα με πετάζεις μέχρι το σπίτι Will you give me a ride home

As Trosborg notes, questions of this type

"serve as compliance-gaining strategies by conveying to the requestee that the requester does not take compliance for granted" (1995:199).

The speaker uses hearer's perspective.

She modifies her request using a lexical downgrader, the choice of the verb $\theta \alpha \mu \varepsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ instead of $\theta \alpha \mu \varepsilon \pi \alpha \varsigma / will$ you take me, that functions as an understater, in order to mitigate the threat of her request on the hearer's face.

She also uses two types of mitigating supportive moves:

a. a preparatory that precedes the head act preparing the content and checking the preparatory conditions for the accomplishment of her request:

Θά 'χεις αυτοκίνητο; Will you have the car?

b. a grounder that follows it providing the hearer with the reason for her request.

γιατί το έχω (:το αυτοκίνητο) στο συνεργείο; because I took it (: *the car*) to a garage?

4 Head acts Requests Strategies- Results

The results of the speakers' preferences found in our data are presented in a percentage scale. We find direct strategies (DSs) as the most frequently chosen ones (59.30%) then conventionally indirect strategies (CISs) (23.30%) and last non conventionally indirect strategies (NCISs) (17.30%). We present in tables the detailed results and discuss them briefly basically in the most frequent substrategies (SSTs).

4.1 DSs Results

DSs reach the percentage of 59.30% in the data. Mood derivable and all equivalent reach the 93.26% of use in the ST. Imperative reaches the 58.43% in the ST. We counted 10.11% subjunctive-imperative equivalent in verbs of full imperative forms' paradigm. Elliptical constructions reach 17.98% in the ST.

Head acts	Appearances /150 requests	Percentage of use in the strategy type (ST)	Percentage of use in the data
DSs	89	100%	59.30%
1. Mood derivable Imperative	52	58.43	34.66
Subjunctive-imperative equivalent	9	10.11	6.00
1a Elliptical constructions	16	17.98	10.66
1b Statements of ability and willingness	6	6.74	4.00
2. Performative	1	1.12	0.66
3. Hedged performative	1	1.12	0.66
4. Obligation Statement	4	4.50	2.66

Table 2 | DSs Results

Regarding their perspective, requests are mostly hearer oriented, as a consequence of the typical second person subject in Greek imperative. We find notable that subjunctive-imperative equivalent requests are also mostly hearer oriented (55%):

Να έρθεις (instead of *έλα*) μεθαύριο να τα πάρεις. [MOXΩ] Come the day after tomorrow to take them.

Further investigating the situations in which speakers chose imperatives to perform their requests, we found (see Figure 1):

46% extreme tension situations, for the expression of negative or positive emotions:

(quarrelling) αφήστε τον άνθρωπο να μιλήσει! [ΔIAX] let the man speak! (awaiting) άντε λέγε, λέγε! [MOXΩ] come on, say it, say it!

29% activity/task oriented situations:

Για πάρ'τη σκάλα [ΔΙΑΧ] Come on, take the ladder!

25% other situations, such as role dependent behavior

Φέρε κι ένα γάλα.. [Δ IAX] And also bring some milk. (wife to husband)

Sifianou (1992: 131-137) also found imperatives in Greek in such situations that she relates with the Greeks' tolerance of the open expression of feelings, to the focus in the task efficient performance, to the acceptance of roles and duties in the Greek household environments and in-group life respectively.



Figure 1 | Head act DS- Mood derivable (Imperative) - Distribution of situations

Elliptical constructions (10.66% in our data) are also observed in our data basically with the verb missing (68.75% /SST) that Sifianou (1992: 152-155) related with repetition avoidance and positive politeness, since participants share common knowledge.

4.2 CISs Results

CISs (23.30% in the data) appear especially in the form of query preparatory (40% in ST). Want/desire/need statements follow (37.14%).

Head acts	Appearances /150 requests	Percentage of use in the ST	Percentage of use in the data
CISs	35	100%	23.30%
5. Want/Desire/Need statement	13	37.14	8.65
6. Permission request	3	8.57	2.00
7. Suggestory formulae	3	8.57	2.00
8. Preparatory	2	5.72	1.33

8a. Query preparatory	14	40.00	9.33

Table 3 | CISs Results

Speakers' preference in our data in the Query preparatory (40% in the ST) complies with results by $M\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ (2013) finding it as the most frequent NS's choice in familiar symmetrical situation (32%), with the difference that in our data is less frequent (9.33%). Speakers mostly used in their questions future indicative (50%) and present indicative (21.4%)

Regarding their perspective, requests of this SST appeared mostly hearer oriented (71.5%):

 $\Theta \alpha \mu o \nu \pi \epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \iota \tau o \nu \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \varsigma$; [MIIPA] Will you tell me what you have told him?

We noted that speakers used frequently the verb $\theta \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$ (want) while they meant $\chi \rho \epsilon i \alpha \hat{\zeta} \rho \mu \alpha i$ (need) even in need statements:

Άρη, χρειάζομαι χρήματα. (...) [ΔΙΑΧ] Aris, I need money (...) Οχι, τώρα τα θέλω τα χρήματα.[ΔΙΑΧ] No, I want the money, now.

4.3 NCISs Results

NCISs were chosen rather frequently (17.30%) in comparison with results by $M\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ (2013). Strong hints predominate among NCISs.

Regarding the perspective, requests were mostly (directly or indirectly) hearer oriented (56.25 %).

Head acts	Appearances /150 requests	Percentage of use in the ST	Percentage of use in the data
NCISs	26	100%	17.30%
9. Strong hint	16	61.54	10.65
9a. Ellipsis (utterance incompleteness)	1	3.85	0.65
10. Mild hint	9	34.61	6.00

 Table 4 | NCISs Results

5 Internal modification - Head Acts

Regarding internal modification in the head acts, we found at least one lexical/phrasal downgrader (37.33%), more than one (10%), at least one upgrader (40.00%), more than one (10%) and interestingly, both lexical/phrasal downgraders and upgraders in one head act (16.66%). (Figure 2)



Figure 2 | Overall distribution of internal modification in head acts

5.1 Lexical/phrasal downgraders

Familiarity markers – classified in politeness markers (32.89% of the downgraders) were the most frequent choice (27.63%) of the downgraders in head acts. The result complies with results by $M\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ (2013) regarding the frequency of familiarity markers and $\lambda i\gamma o$ "a little" in NSs' familiar requests. Understaters (22.37%) and appealers (17.11%) follow.

Pε (re) was the most preferred familiarity (solidarity) marker (68%), παρακαλώ (please) was significantly less preferred (16%):

<u>Ρε,</u> Πέτρο, ζανασκέψου το, <u>ρε</u> [MOXΩ] (*Re*) Petros, think it over <u>(re)</u>

The infrequent use of the politeness marker $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega$ (please) by Greek NSs in our data complies with previous results and remarks that in the Greek culture, overt politeness markers may be perceived as formality and distancing devices (Sifianou 1992:91, Economidou-Kogetsidis 2008, M $\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ 2013):

(...) σε <u>παρακαλώ</u>, αν μπορείς, να μεσολαβήσεις (...) [ΜΠΡΑ]

(...) <u>please</u>, if you can mediate (...)

Investigating the situations in which NSs used more frequently the marker, we found in extreme tension situations, for the expression of negative emotions in the relationships:

(quarrelling) Εγώ σε παρακαλώ! Άντε τώρα! [Δ IAX] Please! Come on now!

The most frequently used understaters were $\lambda i \gamma o$ (a little) (17.65%) and $\kappa \alpha v \alpha$ (some) (17.65%). As also mentioned in Sifianou (1992: 167-172) similarly with diminutives, $\lambda i \gamma o$ (a little) with noun can serve positive politeness needs, can also modify verbs and the collocation is not ambiguous, but it becomes an informal variant of $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\omega}$ "please":

Έλα <u>λίγο</u> πάνω [ΑΔΓΩ] come upstairs <u>for a while</u> Δεν τρώμε <u>κανα</u> φρούτο; [MOXΩ] (Why) don't we have <u>some</u> fruit?

Regarding appealers (17.11%), we find more frequently the token tags $\varepsilon \nu \tau \dot{\alpha} \xi \varepsilon \iota$; (ok?) $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \sigma \iota$; (right?) appealing to the hearer's involvement (Sifianou 1992: 174):

(...) μην αφήνεις οδοντόκρεμα στον νιπτήρα, εντάζει; $[A\Delta\Gamma\Omega]$ (...) leave no toothpaste in the sink, ok?

5.2 Upgraders

Intensifiers (30.34%) and emphatic additions (29.21%) appear in our data as the most frequent upgraders. Time intensifiers (20.22%) follow.

Speakers' preferred intensifiers were $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\varepsilon$ ($\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\varepsilon$ $\mu\pi\rho\dot{\alpha}\beta\sigma$, $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\varepsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\dot{\varepsilon}$) (come on) (44.44%) and $\dot{\varepsilon}\lambda\alpha$ (come on) (22.22%). As emphatic additions speakers mostly used non obligatory (verb) subject (38.46%) and clitic doubling structures (30.77%). $T\dot{\omega}\rho\alpha$ (now) was the preferred (61.11%) time intensifier.

<u>Εγώ</u> σε παρακαλώ! <u>Άντε τώρα!</u> [ΔΙΑΧ] <u>Please</u>! Come on, now!

6 Internal modification - Supportive moves

Internal modification appears also in the supportive moves of the head acts (12.67%) mostly in requests performed by directive strategies (73.68 %): lexical and phrasal downgraders evenly distributed in our classification and also emphatic additions and lexical uptoners.

Regarding internal modification in the supportive moves of the head acts, we found at least one lexical/phrasal downgrader (57.89%), more than one (26.32%), at least one upgrader (63.16%), more than one (26.32%) and interestingly, both lexical/phrasal downgraders and upgraders in one supportive move (21.05%) (Figure 3).

Lexical and phrasal downgraders appear evenly distributed in our classification scheme. Most preferred upgraders are emphatic additions such as non obligatory subject, clitic doubling structures (42.11%) and lexical uptoners indicating speaker's attitude towards request context (31.58%), eg:

Nai, <u>αλλά κι</u> [cajoler] εγώ <u>έχω μπαφιάσει</u> [lexical uptoner] εδώ πέρα (...)[ΔIAX]

Yes, but <u>me also I' ve had enough in here (...)</u>

(...) <u>Εγώ δε μένω</u> [Non obligatory subject] στην πολυκατοικία. Θα <u>το</u> πουλήσω <u>το διαμέρισμα</u> [clitic doubling structure]

 $[\Delta IAX]$ I am not staying in the apartment building. I will sell the apartment (I will sell it).



Figure 3 | Overall distribution of internal modification in supportive moves

7 Pedagogical implications

Following Martínez-Flor (2008), we propose the integration of our analysed data in the instruction of the speech act of requesting in the indicative description of a lesson in the Greek as L2 classroom (proficiency level intermediate) we present below:

Firstly we describe to the learners a requesting utterance without giving overloading metalinguistic information. Then we ask learners to produce written requests in L1 and also answer questions aiming at raising their pragmatic and sociopragmatic consciousness, e.g. Underline the words or phrases indicating only what you ask the hearer to do. / Do you notice any differences in the ways you ask him/her what you want according to his/her age, the period of your relationship, his/her duties etc. We have a class discussion about their choices aiming at their strategies /modification devices noticing in L1 and at possible interlanguage pragmatic transfer.

Next we present film scenes e.g. four scenes of the film $\ll \Delta IAX \gg having as common$ theme requests to Pavlos performed by familiar persons of his, in two parts: firstly we present two scenes including requests performed by DS and secondly, two scenes including requests performed by the more demanding IS (CIS/NCIS), as a starting point for a sort of metapragmatic follow up class discussion. Before that, we have distributed relevant questions to the learners and repeated, if necessary, the presentation of the scenes. We give explanations, when necessary, about the pragmalinguistic forms and also about the sociopragmatic factors related to the scenes.

Then we teach explicitly the speech act of request, presenting the pragmalinguistic features concerning strategies and mitigation devices and also pointing out the importance of the sociopragmatic factors involved in an effective request performance. Teaching may be supported by contextualized examples from the discussed scenes.

Then in a class activity, we ask the classification of the strategies used in the presented film scenes (eg. filling a table: *What is everybody asking from Pavlos?*). We ask the comparison between learners' choices in performing requests in L1 and characters' choices in the presented films.

Next we distribute a discourse completion test based on situations of selected film scenes, asking learners to perform written requests (*e.g. How would you ask your friend, Bach, while taking a drink in a bar to tell your favorite story about Woodstock?* $(A\Delta\Gamma\Omega)$). We ask learners to present their choices in the distributed situations in a class discussion aiming at feedback. We present related film scenes, learners compare and discuss on their choices.

Finally during a role-play activity learners perform orally requests in similar situations.

8 Conclusion

The results of NSs' preferences in performing and modifying requests in familiar situations found in our film data, mostly agree with previous researches' results regarding Greek NSs' requesting behaviour (Sifianou 1992, Economidou-Kogetsidis 2008, $M\pi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ 2013) and also confirm the claim that greek society is oriented towards positive politeness.

Some pedagogical implications for the integration of our analysed data in the instruction of the speech act of requesting in the Greek as an L2 classroom were proposed and the test of the acquisition results of our proposal could be examined in a future study.

References

- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper. 1989. "Investigating Cross-cultural Pragmatics: An Introductory Overview." In *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies,* edited by Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper, 1-34. New Jersey: Ablex.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena." In *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*, edited by Esther N. Goody, 56-310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, Maria. 2008. "Internal and External Mitigation in Interlanguage Requests Production: The Case of Greek Learners of English." *Journal of Politeness Research* 4: 111-138.

- Martínez-Flor, Alicia. 2008. "Analysing Request Modification Devices in Films: Implications for Pragmatic Learning in Instructed Foreign Language Contexts." In *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, edited by Eva Alcón Soler, and Maria Pilar Safond Jordà, 245-280. Dordrecht: Springer Science + Business Media B.V.
- Μαυρομάτη, Ελισάβετ. 2011. Πραγματολογία της Διαγλώσσας Γλωσσική Ευγένεια. Αιτήματα: Ανάλυση & Διδακτική Αξιοποίηση Δεδομένων από το Σύγχρονο Ελληνικό Κινηματογράφο. Διατμηματικό Μεταπτυχιακό Πρόγραμμα Διδασκαλίας της Νέας Ελληνικής ως Ξένης Γλώσσας. Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών. Μπέλλα, Σπυριδούλα. 2013. "Καθάρισε Αμέσως την Κουζίνα Παρακαλώ!': Αιτήματα Μαθητών της Ελληνικής ως Ξένης Γλώσσας" [Clean up the kitchen immediately please! Requests by learners of Greek as a foreign language]. In Major Trends in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics 3: Selected Papers from the 20th ISTAL, edited by Nikolas Lavidas, Thomaï Alexiou, and Areti-Maria Sougari, 267-283. London: De Gruyter.
- Sifianou, Maria. 1992. Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-cultural Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trosborg, Anna. 1995. Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Appendix

- [ΔΙΑΧ] «Ο ΔΙΑΧΕΙΡΙΣΤΗΣ» "THE BUILDING MANAGER" (2009) by Periklis Hoursoglou
- [MOXΩ] *«MOΛΙΣ XΩΡΙΣΑ»* "JUST SEPARATED" (2007) by Vasilis Mirianthopoulos
- [ΟΞΓΝ] «*OΞΥΓΟΝΟ*» (2003) "OXYGEN" (2003) by Thanassis Papathanassiou & Michalis Reppas
- [МПРА] *«МПРАZIЛЕРО»* "BRAZILERO" (2001) by Sotiris Goritsas
- [AΔΓΩ] «*O* $A\Delta EP \Phi O\Sigma$ MOY KI $E \Gamma \Omega$ » "MY BROTHER AND I" (1998) by Antonis Kokkinos