

REQUEST FORMS IN THARU AND ENGLISH

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master's Degree in Education**

**Submitted by
RAMA NAND CHAUDHARY**

**Faculty of Education
Tribhuvan University, kirtipur
Kathmandu, Nepal**

2009

REQUEST FORMS IN THARU AND ENGLISH

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master's Degree in Education
(Specialization in English Education)**

By

RAMA NAND CHAUDHARY

Faculty of Education

Tribhuvan University Kirtipur

Kathmandu, Nepal

2009

T.U. Regd. No. : 6293-95

Second Year Exam

Roll No. 280338/061

Date of Approval of the Thesis

Proposal: 2065-11-28

Date of Submission: 2066-04-04

DECLARATION

I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that this thesis is original, no part of it was earlier submitted for the candidature of research degree to any university.

Date: 2066-04-01

Rama Nand Chaudhary

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that **Mr. Rama Nand Chaudhary** has prepared the thesis entitled “**Request Forms in Tharu and English**” under my guidance and supervision. I recommend the thesis for acceptance.

Date: 2066-04-03

.....
Mrs. Hima Rawal (Guide)
Teaching Assistant
Department of English Education
Faculty of Education
T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu
Nepal

RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for evaluation by the following
Research Guidance Committee:

Signature

Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra

Reader and Head

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Chairperson

Dr. Anjana Bhattarai

Reader

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Member

Mrs. Hima Rawal (Guide)

Teaching Assistant

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Member

Date: 2066-04-08

EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following
Thesis Evaluation Committee:

Signature

Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra

Reader and Head

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Chairperson

Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi

Professor

Department of English Education

Chairperson

English and Other Foreign Languages

Education Subject Committee

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Member

Mrs. Hima Rawal (Guide)

Teaching Assistant

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Member

Date: 2066-4-11

DEDICATED

TO

My Parents,

Gurus and Gurumas,

Tharu People and

Community

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor, **Mrs. Hima Rawal**, Teaching Assistant, Department of English Education, University Campus, T.U., Kirtipur who guided me throughout the study. Her continuous guidance, enlightening ideas, motivation and invaluable suggestion in this study are ever memorable. I would not have been able to present this thesis in the present form without her co-operation and encouragement.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to **Dr. Chandeshwar Mishra**, Reader and Head, Department of English Education, T.U. Kirtipur, and Chairperson of the Research Guidance Committee, for his supporting ideas and providing me with an opportunity to conduct this research study. Likewise, I am heartily grateful to my guru **Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**, Professor Department of English Education. I am also grateful to **Dr. Anjana Bhattarai**, member of the Research Guidance Committee, for providing valuable suggestions and supporting ideas.

I am indebted to my guru **Dr. Shishir Kumar Sthapit**, the retired Professor, Department of English Education, T.U. Kirtipur, and **Dr. Shanti Basnyat**, Professor, Department of English Education, T.U. Kirtipur, for their kind co-operation, encouragement towards the study and for providing me with in depth knowledge during my academic years.

I would also like to express my gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya**, **Mr. Vishnu Prasad Singh Rai**, **Dr. Bal Mukunda Bhandari** and other teachers and staff of the Department of English Education, T.U. Kirtipur for their suggestions and encouragement to accomplish this thesis.

Similarly, I would like to thank my friends **Mr. Balikant Chaudhary**, **Mr. Bhupendra Prasad Chaudhary**, **Mr. Dilip Kumar Chaudhary**, **Mr. Roshan Prasad Chaudhary**, **Mr. Mahesh Raj Chaudhary**, **Mr. Kishor Kumar**

Chaudhary and **Mr. Shree Narayan Chaudhary** who directly and indirectly helped me to complete this thesis.

I cannot stand without expressing my gratitude to all my family members, well wishers and all those who directly and indirectly contributed to complete this work.

Last but not the least, I owe a debt of gratitude to **Mr. Rajan Kalyan** who helped me in computer typing and setting of this work.

Rama Nand Chaudhary

2009

ABSTRACT

This thesis entitled “Request Forms in Tharu and English” was an attempt to find out the request forms in the Tharu language and compare and contrast them with those of English. The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data. The sample population of the study consisted of 80 native speakers of Tharu including educated and uneducated. Among 80 informants, 40 were educated and equal number of uneducated informants were there. The researcher used stratified random sampling procedure to sample the population. The interview schedule for uneducated and written questionnaire for educated population were the research tools for the data collection. On the basis of the collected data the analysis and interpretation were done descriptively and comparatively with the help of tables, diagrams and illustrations. The finding showed that Tharu native speakers were less polite than English native speakers and the Tharu people used 57.77% direct requests.

This thesis contains four chapters viz. introduction, methodology, analysis and interpretation, and finding and recommendations. The first chapter deals with introduction which consists of general background, the English language in Nepal, the languages of Nepal, the Tharu language, language functions, the request forms of English sentences, importance of requesting in language, an overview of pragmatics, different views on politeness, need and importance of CA, review of the related literature, objectives of the study, significance of the study and the definitions of the specific terms. The second chapters deals with methodology, adopted for the study. It consists of sources of data, population of the study, sampling procedure, tools for data collection and limitations of the study. Similarly, the third chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data. It consists of request forms in the Tharu language with illustrations and comparison of the request forms of the Tharu language with those of English. The fourth chapter deals with the findings and recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Recommendation for Acceptance	II
Recommendation for Evaluation	III
Evaluation and Approval	IV
Dedication	V
Acknowledgements	VI-VII
Abstract	VIII
Table of Contents	IX-XI
List of Tables	XII
Abbreviations and Symbols	XIII
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
	1-22
1.1 General Background	1
1.1.1 The English Language in Nepal	2
1.1.2 The Languages of Nepal	4
1.1.3 The Tharu Language	5
1.1.4 Dialects of the Tharu Language	6
1.1.5 Language Functions	7
1.1.5.1 The Request Form of English Sentences	9
1.1.5.2 Importance of Requesting in Languages	11
1.1.6 An Overview of Pragmatics	11
1.1.7 Different Views on Politeness	12
1.1.8 Need and Importance of Contrastive Analysis (CA)	14
1.2 Review of the Related Literature	19
1.3 Objectives of the Study	20
1.4 Significance of the Study	21
1.5 Definitions of the Specific Terms	21
 CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	
	23-25
2.1 Sources of Data	23
2.1.1 Primary Sources	23
2.1.2 Secondary Sources	23
2.2 Population of the Study	23

2.3	Sampling Procedure	23
2.4	Tools for Data Collection	24
2.5	Process of Data Collection	24
2.6	Limitations of the Study	25
CHAPTER THREE: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION		26-49
3.1	Request Forms in the Tharu Language	26
3.2	Total Forms of Request Given by the Tharu	27
3.2.1	Total Forms of Request Found between Friends	28
3.2.2	Total Forms of Request Found between Strangers	31
3.2.3	Total Forms of Requests Found between Students and Teachers	33
3.2.4	Total Forms of Request Found Between Relatives	35
3.2.5	Total Forms of Request Found Between Customers and Shopkeepers	38
3.2.6	Total Forms of Request Found Between Patients and Doctors	40
3.2.7	Total Request Forms Found in the Relationship of Neighbours	41
3.3	Total Request Forms of the Native Speakers of Tharu in the Item-wise Relationship	44
3.4	Total Request Forms of Educated and Uneducated Tharu Speakers	44
3.5	Comparison between the Request Forms of Tharu and those of English	45
3.5.1	Comparison of Direct Request	45
3.5.2	Comparison of Indirect Request	47
3.5	Total Request Forms of Native Speakers of Tharu	48
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		50-53
4.1	Findings	50
4.1.1	Request Forms in Tharu	50
4.1.2	Similarities and Differences between Request Forms in the Tharu and English Languages	51
4.2	Recommendations	52
REFERENCES		54-56
APPENDICES		57-61

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
Table No. 1	Population of the Study	23
Table No. 2	Request Forms in the Tharu Language	26
Table No. 3	Total Responses used by Tharu Speakers	27
Table No. 4	Total Responses Used by Friends	28
Table No. 5	Request Forms in the Friend-Friend Relationship	30
Table No. 6	Total Responses Used by Strangers	31
Table No. 7	List of Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Strangers	32
Table No. 8	Total Responses Used by Teachers and Students	33
Table No. 9	List of Total Request Forms in the Context of Student-Teacher Relationship	35
Table No. 10	Total Responses used by Relatives	35
Table No. 11	List of Total Request Forms in the Context of Relatives	37
Table No. 12	Total Responses used by Customers and Shopkeepers	38
Table No. 13	List of Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Customers and Shopkeepers	39
Table No. 14	Total Forms of Request Found Between Patients and Doctors	40
Table No. 15	Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Patients and Doctors	41
Table No. 16	Total Responses Used by Neighbours	41
Table No. 17	Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Neighbours	43
Table No. 18	Total Request Forms Used by Tharu Native Speakers in Item-Wise Relationship	44
Table No. 19	Total Request Forms of Educated and Uneducated Tharu Speakers	44
Table No. 20	Comparison of Direct Request	46
Table No. 21	Comparison of Indirect Request	47
Table No. 22	Total Request Forms Used by Tharu Language Speakers	48

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

%	-	Percentage
DR	-	Direct Requests
e.g.	-	For example
F	-	Frequency of Responses
i.e.	-	id est (that is to say)
IdR	-	Indirect Requests
NSs	-	Native Speakers
No.	-	Number
Non-R	-	Non-requests
S.No.	-	Situation Number
T.U.	-	Tribhuvan University
TSs	-	Tharu Speakers
FL	-	Foreign Language

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background

Language is the concrete act of speaking, writing or singing in a given situation. It is the principle of signaling system or instrument of communication used by humans for the transmission of information, ideas etc. It can be viewed as an instrument of communication. It ensures to produce new utterance which neither the speaker nor his hearers may ever have made or have heard before any listener. It brings change in human beings, family, society, nations and world. It also transmits message, knowledge, experience, thoughts, desires, emotions and feelings from one person to another and from one generation to another.

Sapir (1921, p. 8) defines, “Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols”. Similarly, Chomsky (1957, p. 13) defines, “Language is a set (finite or infinite) of sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements.” In the same way, Hall (1968, p.158) says that language is “the institution whereby humans communicate and interact with each other by means of habitually used oral – auditory arbitrary symbols.” Likewise, Wardhaugh (1942, p. 3) defines language as “a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used for human communication.”

Language is the medium through which the religion, history, literature, philosophy, politics, psychology and several other subjects are created and transmitted to the upcoming generations. It has played a great role to preserve the human civilization. It is common to all human beings. It is such a unique possession that sets them apart from the rest of living

beings. It is so essential form of communication among human beings that it is difficult to think of the existence of society without language in the world.

Language plays a great role in the life of human beings. It helps to make aware, to enlighten and to convince the persons who are socially backwards. Language also ensures to give guidance and counseling to those persons who are socially humiliated. It can be viewed as an instrument of communication. It serves to establish sound meaning correlations so that messages can be sent by the exchange of overt acoustic signals. It makes use of verbal elements such as sounds, words, and phrases, which are arranged in certain ways to make sentence. Language also refers to non-linguistic symbols such as expressive gestures, signals of various kinds, traffic lights, road-signs, flags and so on. It also refers to other codes, the deaf and dumb and Braille alphabets, the symbols of mathematics and logic, etc.

Finally, language is a means of nourishing and developing culture and establishing human relations.

1.1.1 The English Language in Nepal

English developed in the middle ages in southern Ireland and south-west Scotland in the 17th and 18th century in North America and Caribbean and Northern Ireland in the 18th and 19th century in Australia and Africa. Colonization patterns, demography and politics have also played a great role to develop the English language according to the circumstances of the different religions.

English is popular among the languages of the world, throughout history. It is viewed as a family of varieties. It has an increasingly influential

position in the world. According to Law (2006, p. 214), “Countries using English as either a first or a second language are located on all six inhabited continents, and the total population of these countries is about 49% of the world’s population.”

The English language fulfils a variety of roles worldwide. It can be national language, official language, administrative language, language of communication, second language or third language (or even fourth language). It may be important as the language of commerce, education and government.

English has rich vocabulary and literature. Most of the books, novels, dramas, articles and fictions of the world are written in the English language. It is taught and learnt as a foreign language in many countries including Nepal. Most of the books of the world are translated in English. Thus, it is inevitable source of knowledge for non-native speakers. It means that principle of language is for international communication and gateway to the world body of knowledge.

The development of the English language is closely connected with the rise of the Prime Minister Jang Bahadur Rana. After visiting England, he established Durbar High School in 1854 A.D. in order to give English education to the children of Rana’s family only. It was the first school to teach English in Nepal. After that, a number of schools and colleges were established in the country after the establishment of the democracy in 1951 A.D. At present, it has occupied an important role in the education system of Nepal. It is taught as a compulsory subject from grade one to bachelor’s degree. We need English to link between outer world and exchange ideas with foreigners in different areas. We need English for two purposes viz. academic and communicative.

1.1.2 The Languages of Nepal

Nepal is a multi-racial, multi-religious, multi-cultural and multi-lingual country. Nepal is a small country although it has been very fertile for languages. According to the Census Report of 2001, there are 60 different ethnic communities and more than 90 languages spoken in the country. Nepal also exhibits a remarkable wealth of cultures and languages. Thus, this small nation possesses cultural diversity and linguistics plurality. Most of the languages are found to have only the spoken form. Nepal is a country where people of different castes, religions, and cultures speak more than 90 languages. Apart from Nepali, which is the official language of the country, a very few languages such as Maithili, Awadhi, Bhojpuri, Newari, Limbu and Tibetan have their own scripts and written literature. The languages enumerated in 2001 census belong to the four language families, viz. Indo-European, Sino-Tibetan, Austro-Asiatic, and Dravidian.

In Nepalese context, Indo-European family of languages mainly comprises Indo-Aryan group of languages. These Indo-Aryan languages are spoken by the majority of Nepal's total population. The major Indo-European languages spoken in Nepal are Nepali, Maithili, Tharu, Rajbansi, Bhojpuri, etc. The Indo-Aryan languages spoken in Nepal are mainly distributed from western to the eastern hills and the terai and also the far western mountain though they are spoken with low density in almost all the remaining parts of the country.

Another group of Nepal's languages is Tibeto-Burman group, which comes under Sino-Tibetan family. Though it is spoken by relatively lesser number of people than the Indo-European family, it consists of the largest number of languages, viz. about 75 languages. Mostly, the languages

under this family are spoken by indigenous groups. Some of them are Newar, Chepang, Magar, Tamang, Gurung, Sampang, Limbu etc.

The third language family is Austro-Asiatic language family. These languages are spoken by groups of tribal people from the eastern terai. Some major languages of this family are Mon-Khmer, Kharia, Munda, Santhali.

Likewise, Dravidian language family includes two languages spoken in Nepal i.e. Jhangar and Kishan. Jhangar is spoken on the province of Koshi river in the eastern region of Nepal and Kishan is spoken in Jhapa district.

According to Rai, V.S. (2005, p. 136), the languages of Nepal are classified into three groups; first, the languages which have established written traditions such as Nepali, Newari, Maithili, Limbu, Bhojpuri, Awadhi, Tibetan; second, the languages which are as emerging tradition of writing, e.g. Tharu, Tamang, Magar, Gurung and the Rai group of languages; and the third, the languages which have no any script or written literature for the purpose of imparting primary education of minority languages including Sattar/Santhad, Danuwar, Chepang, Thami, Majhi, Jhangadh, Dhimal, Darai, Kham, Kagate, Kaike, Kumal, Bote, Byanshi and several languages of the Rai group.

1.1.3 The Tharu Language

The Tharu Language is one of the important languages spoken in the Tharu communities of Nepal. It is one of the main languages spoken in Nepal. There is a large number of native speakers of the Tharu language in several districts of Nepal. The majority of the Tharu speakers are actually found in Jhapa, Morang, Sunsari, Saptari, Siraha, Udaypur,

Dhanusha, Mahotari, Rautahata, Bara, Parsa, Makwanpur, Chitwan, Nawalparasi, Kapilbastu, Dang, Banke, Bardiya, Kanchanpur and Kailali. According to Census Report 2001, the Tharu language is the fourth largest language used in Nepal and spoken by 5.86 percent of the Nepalese as their mother tongue.

The Tharu language is an Indo-European language spoken in the Terai regions of Nepal, mainly in the Tharu community. It is a language of the Indo-European family. Some linguists and scholars of Tharu view that Tharu had its own script but in course of time, it disappeared being dominated by other languages. Tharu had 'Kaithi' script (Chaudhary, 2064). At present, Tharus are not using their own script, they use Devnagari script.

1.1.4 Dialects of the Tharu Language

There are mainly seven dialects of the Tharu language. They are Morangia, Saptaria, Mahotaria, Chitwania, Dangoria and Dekhuria, Katharia, and Rana.

1.1.4.1 Morangia Dialect

This dialect is spoken in Morang and Sunsari districts.

1.1.4.2 Saptaria Dialect

This dialect is spoken in Saptari, Siraha, Udaypur, Jhapa, Morang and Sunsari districts.

1.1.4.3 Mahotaria Dialect

This dialect is spoken in Mahotari district.

1.1.4.4 Chitwania Dialect

This dialect is spoken in Chitwan and Nawalparasi districts.

1.1.4.5 Dangoria and Deukhuria Dialect

This dialect is spoken in Dang, Kapilvastu, Bardiya, Banke, Surkhet, Rupendehi, Kailali, and Kanchanpur districts.

1.1.4.6 Kathariya Dialect

This dialect is spoken in Kailali district.

1.1.4.7 Rana Dialect

This dialect is spoken in Kailali and Kanchanpur districts.

1.1.5 Language Functions

Language function refers to the purpose for which an utterance or a unit of language is used. It can be broadly classified as grammatical and communicative functions. Grammatical function deals with the relationship that a constituent has with another constituent. The main function of language is communicative function. Communicative function of language refers to the communicative goal for which a language is used in a community. Several forms may serve just function or several functions can be realized just in one form. Different linguists classify language functions differently. According to Aarts and Aarts (1986, p.95), there are four types of language functions. They are as follows:

- i) Statement function
- ii) Question function
- iii) Command function
- iv) Exclamation function

Likewise, according to Corder (1973, p.32), there are six categories of language functions. They are as follows:

- (i) Personal function
- (ii) Directive function
- (iii) Referential function
- (iv) Phatic function
- (v) Metalinguistic function
- (vi) Imaginative function

Wilkins (1976,p.44) has mentioned six functions of language in his notional syllabus under the categories of communicative function. They are:

- (i) Judgment and evaluation
- (ii) Suasion
- (iii) Argument
- (iv) Rational enquiry and exposition
- (v) Personal emotions
- (vi) Emotional relations

According to Van Ek (1957, p.19), there are six categories of language functions. They are as follows:

- (i) Imparting and seeking factual information.
- (ii) Expressing and finding out intellectual attitudes.
- (iii) Expressing and finding out emotional attitudes.
- (iv) Expressing and finding out moral attitudes.
- (v) Getting things done.
- (vi) Socializing.

1.1.5.1 The Request Form of English Sentences

Request is a kind of language function. “Getting things done” is one of categories of language functions. When we ask someone to do something, we make request. It is a sign of politeness. It also symbolizes the norms of culture and civilization of the society. It helps us to behave in ways that are acceptable to our society. The aim of request form of language function is to use language in an appropriate situation or to use different requesting functions according to purpose. According to Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary (2000, p.1084), “Request is an act of asking formally and politely.” The communicative function ‘request’ can be expressed using several linguistic forms like imperative, declarative, interrogative and moodless respectively. According to Matreyek (1983, p. 14), some linguistic forms that can be used to express requests in English are follows:

- a) V¹ + obj, please.
- b) V¹ + obj., will you ?
- c) Can + you + V¹ + ?
- d) Will + you + V¹ +?
- e) Could you please?
- f) Would you?
- g) Would you mind + v-ing?
- h) Do you think you could?
- i) I wonder if you could?
- j) I don't suppose you could, could you?
- k) Do you think you could possibly?
- l) Base form of verb + obj

All these forms (different kinds of sentences) serve the same communicative function 'request', i.e. asking people to do something. But their uses are different according to the context and situations. They are not only used according to the context or situations but also with what type of people you are talking to. (a), (b), (c) and (d) are used for asking friends while (e), (f), (g) and (h) are used for any one at normal situations. But they are more polite respectively. Similarly, (i), (j) and (k) are used formally to complete strangers, important guests, and when the situation is extremely inconvenient for the listener. Finally, (l) is used formally in classroom and informally in public speech. Such polite phrases/forms are used when talking to someone we do not know or when we are asking a friend to do something difficult or important. The main purpose of using such expression is to make his/her language tactful, polite, gentle and effective. The examples of such expressions which are more polite respectively are given below:

- a. Talk to him, O.K.?
- b. Proof-read this for me, will you?
- c. Please let me have that book when you are finished.
- d. Can you help me with this?
- e. Could you please turn down the radio a little?
- f. May I open the window?
- g. May I please have a glass of water?
- h. May I ask you to mail this for me on your way to work?
- i. Would you mind watching this for me a few minutes?
- j. Would it be possible to type this letter before you go home?
- k. If I can make a request, I'd like to hear some classical music.

1.1.5.2 Importance of Requesting in Languages

Request is a polite form of asking something. It is a sign of politeness. It differs from language to language, society to society and culture to culture. It depends on sex, age, social class, ethnic group and culture. It establishes civilization and culture of society. It serves interpersonal functions. It introduces personality, social status, and educational qualification of any person. It establishes the relationship of friendship, and brotherhood from one person to another and one country to another.

Politeness is culture specific. It means polite in one society may be less polite or utterly impolite in other society. For example, a husband in Tharu society never addresses his wife with an honourable pronoun but there is no pronoun distinction between husband and wife in English society.

Thus, we can say that request depends upon social norms, rules and regulations as well as cultural phenomena.

1.1.6 An Overview of Pragmatics

Pragmatics that was neglected in past has now been able to capture the attention of linguists so much. It is growing everyday. It is no longer a rag rag but a full fledged discipline which is considered to be indispensable in understanding the language in general and communication in particular. In 1938, Morris used the term pragmatics in his division of semiotics into three branches of inquiry. But its importance was felt when Chomsky (1965) incorporated semantic aspect in his theory of TG grammar. According to Hymes (1972), a normal child does not only require sentence as grammatical as appropriate. This presented a peculiar relationship between content and use of language.

Pragmatics studies the relationship between linguistic forms and the uses of those forms. Language is used for communicative purpose. If the communication is made considering the appropriate situation, it is very effective and meaningful. It takes into account the context in which a speaker hears, situation and topic are involved to understand the language. Levinson (1983, p. 24) states, “Pragmatics is the study of the ability of language users to pair the sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate.” This definition clears pragmatics as a notion of appropriateness. A good language user should have the ability to use the language which is grammatically correct as well as contextually appropriate.

According to Leech (1983) pragmatics as the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions. He talks about pragmatics as general pragmatics and socio-pragmatics. General pragmatics is language specific whereas socio-pragmatics is culture specific. General pragmatics studies meaning in relation to speech situation but socio-pragmatics is the sociological interface of pragmatics. Leech (1983, p. 10) states that in socio-pragmatics “the politeness principle operates variably in different cultures or language communities, in different social situations, among different social classes etc.”

So, we can say that politeness depends on the social situations and social classes of the people. It is an essential factor to make a sound relationship between speakers and hearers.

1.1.7 Different Views on Politeness

Different scholars have presented different views on politeness Grundy (2006, p. 146) presents, “Politeness phenomena are one manifestation of wider concept of etiquette or appropriate behaviour.” According to him,

politeness affects the speaker differently because polite utterance encodes the relationship between speaker and hearer.

Yule (2000, p. 60) states that politeness can be accomplished in situation of social distance and closeness. He further accounts, “Showing awareness for another person’s face when that other seems socially distance is often described in terms of respect or difference showing equivalent awareness when the other is socially close is often described in terms of friendliness.”

Goody (1978, p. 108) says that the linguistic realizations of positive politeness are in many respects, simply representative of the normal linguistic behaviour between intimacy where interest and approval of each other’s personality, presuppositions indicating shared wills and shared knowledge.

Asher (1994, p. 3206) proposed that “in ordinary language use, politeness refers to proper social conduct and tactful consideration of others.”

In expressing politeness, the anthropologist, Levinson (1983) distinguished between positive politeness strategies (those which show the closeness and intimacy between speaker and hearer) and negative politeness strategies (those which indicate the social distance between speaker and hearer).

These views clear that politeness is a social factor. It makes closeness between speaker and hearer. It shows the social distance and closeness. And it expresses the appropriate behaviour between the interlocutors.

1.1.8 Need and Importance of Contrastive Analysis (CA)

There are more than 1000 languages spoken in the world. In course of study about different languages, the tradition of comparison and contrast appears between and among different languages. First attempt to compare and contrast between and among different languages was done by Sir William Jones in 1780 which was the birth of comparative philology. The study of historical or genetic connection between languages in which two languages are related means they develop from one and same language and single source language .Later on it was realized that single source of two or more languages do not indicate that their formal characteristics are similar in all or most respects . So, CA was introduced in the late 1940s and 1950s was highly popularized in the 1960s and its popularity declined in the 1970s. The development of CA for foreign language teaching can be traced back to the American linguist, Fries (1945, p.32) who made the first clarion call for it. “The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner.”

According to James (1880, p. 3), “CA is a linguistic enterprise aimed at producing inverted (i.e. contrastive, not comparative) two – valued typologies (CA is always concerned with a particular of language), and founded on the assumption that languages can be compared.” It is the method of analyzing the structures of any two languages with a view to estimate the differential aspects of their systems, irrespective of their genetic affinity or level of development. Comparison of two languages

becomes useful when it adequately describes the sound structure and grammatical structure of two languages with comparative statements giving due emphasis to the compatible items in the two systems.

As stated earlier, CA compares two or more languages in order to find out the similarities and differences between them. It compares either two languages (English and Tharu) i.e. inter-lingual or cross linguistic comparison or two dialects (Western Nepali and Eastern Nepali) i.e. intra-lingual comparison. What languages and dialects it compares may be on phonological level, morphological level, syntactic level, and discourse level and so on. This comparison enables us to identify the similarities and differences between L_1 and L_2 . Then, their similarities and differences help us to predict the areas of ease and difficulty, respectively in learning L_2 . CA, which is deeply rooted in the behaviouristic and structuralist approaches of the day, claims that the greater the differences, the greater the difficulty and the more instances of errors will occur.

A second language is learnt by those who already speak another language, that is why, they transfer the system of the L_1 in learning L_2 . The transfer may be either positive or negative. The transfer may be positive, if the past learning helps the present learning. This is called facilitation. On the contrary, the transfer may be negative, if the past learning interferes with or hinders the present learning. This is called interference. The ease or difficulty in learning L_2 depends on that it is similar to L_1 or not. If L_1 is similar to L_2 , it will be easy to learn and there will be less chances of committing errors. Conversely, if L_1 is different from L_2 , it will be difficult to learn and there will be more chances of committing errors. CA, by specifying just which features the two languages have in common and which they do not, can alert the teacher to

what in the foreign language really needs to be taught. Similarly, CA is helpful in identifying the areas of difficulties in learning and error in performance, determining the areas which the learners have to learn with greater emphasis and designing teaching and learning materials for those particular areas that need more attention.

CA is important from pedagogical point of view. James (1980) points out three traditional pedagogical applications of CA. According to him, CA has application in predicting and diagnosing a proportion of the L_2 errors committed by learners with a common L_1 and in the design of testing instruments for such learners. As the learners are learning the language and errors appear, the teachers can utilize their knowledge of the target and native languages to understand the sources of errors. CA also helps the teachers or the material writers to plan and grade teaching materials. Syllabus makers can make use of the description of languages and contrastive studies in grading the items to be taught from known to unknown, similar to dissimilar, general rules to exceptions and from universal to language specific items. In the areas of testing, CA mainly deals with about what to test and how to test. If items are isomorphic between L_1 and L_2 are assumed to be easy for the learner, they can be by passed in the test. The fact is that it will be more informative for the tester to test only the learning problems predicted by CA. Turning to the matter of how to test, if a multiple choice type of objective item is being constructed, a CA of L_1 and L_2 will suggest the types of distracters to use, as Harris (1966, p. 39) says, "The most effective distracters in a test item will be those which evoke first language responses from those subjects who have not fully mastered the very different CA at discourse patterns of the target language." Likewise, CA at discourse level contributes to the communicative teaching of languages by providing a mapping of the

strategies employed by interlocutors in building discourse in different linguistic and sociolinguistic settings and indicating how different linguistic structures in different languages are used and exploited in order to develop specific functions in building discourse. Sthapit (1978, p. 23) writes the roles of CA in L₂ teaching in the following ways:

When we start learning an L₂ our mind is no longer a clean slate. Our knowledge of L₁ has, as it were, stiffened our linguistically flexible mind. The linguistic habits of L₁, deeply rooted in our mental and verbal activities do not allow us to learn freely the new linguistic habits of L₂. That is to say that the interference of the habits of L₁ is a key factor that accounts for the difficulties in learning an L₂. In other words, L₁ interference stands as main obstacle on our way to L₂ learning. Learning an L₂ is, therefore essentially learning to overcome this obstacle. So any attempt to teach an L₂ should be preceded by an explanation of the nature of possible influence of L₁ behaviour in L₂ behaviour. This is precisely what CA does.

The theoretical foundations of CA, which have also been known as “contrastive analysis hypotheses”, or “assumptions of contrastive analysis”, were formulated in Lado’s ‘Linguistics across Cultures’(1957). In this book Lado (1957, p. 1- 2) has provided three underlying assumptions of CA, which have significant role in language teaching.

- a) Individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to foreign language and culture, both productivity when attempting to speak the language and respectively when attempting to grasp and understand the language.
- b) In the comparison between native and foreign languages lies the key to ease or difficulty in foreign language learning.
- c) The teacher who has made comparison of the foreign language with the native language of the students will know better what the real learning problems are and can better provide for teaching them.

From the above discussion, it has become obvious that the theoretical foundations of contrastive analysis (i.e. CA hypothesis) are based on the propositions of behaviorist school of psychology and structural linguistics. In fact, CA hypothesis has two facets: linguistic and psychological.

Nepal is a multilingual country where L₂ or FL teaching and learning is inevitable. Thus, CA is helpful for teachers, linguists, textbook designers, testing experts, and syllabus designers and so other. CA is one of the various pedagogical aids for the teacher which helps him/her to add more knowledge and to sharpen his/her knowledge so that the ability to detect errors can be improved. Because of its highly significant scope in the area of L₂ teaching and learning, linguists are interested in the preparation of

contrastive grammar because it is highly useful to L₂ learners for a more effective process of L₂ teaching and learning.

1.2 Review of the Related Literature

Some research works have been carried out to compare some aspects of English and the Tharu languages in the Department of English Education. The related literature to the present study is given below.

Pandey (1997) carried out a research entitled “Apologies between English and Nepali Languages: A Comparative Study.” He concluded that the native English speakers were more apologetic compared to native Nepali speakers. Similarly, Mahato (2001) carried out a research on “S-V Agreement in the Tharu and English Languages” and he found that second and third person pronouns do not change for honorific expressions in English whereas they do in Tharu language spoken in Parsa district of the Tharu language. Similarly, Chapagain (2002) carried out a research entitled “Request Forms in the English and Nepali Languages: A Comparative Study.” She concluded that the English people were found to be more polite among all the relations compared to Nepali.

Khanal (2004) carried out a research work on “A Comparative Study on the Forms of Address of the Tharu and English.” His research shows that Tharu native speakers use a lot of number of addressing terms than the English native speakers. English native speakers use the first name frequently to address someone but it is so less in Tharu native speakers. In the same way, Chaudhary (2005) conducted a research on “Pronominals in the Tharu and English Languages.” He found that both Tharu and English have more or less similar number of persons and differ from each other in second person pronouns. He also found that English pronouns do not have alternatives but the Tharu has alternatives.

Katwal (2006) carried out a research on “English and Tharu Kinship Terms.” He found on his study that English kinship terms are less in number in comparison to Tharu kinship terms. Likewise, Chaudhary (2008) conducted a research on “Verbal Affixation in Tharu and English.” He found that Tharu has more number of verbal affixes in comparison to English and they are more complex as well. In the same way, Chaudhary (2008) carried out research on “Pluralization in the Tharu and English Languages” and found that nouns are pluralized by adding suffixes like -s, -b, -sun and -ur and written separately and pronouns are also pluralized in the same way, verb has no plural form in the Tharu language. Similarly, Yadava (2008) carried a research on “A Comparative Study on Request Forms in the English and Maithili Languages.” He found that Non-native English people were far more polite than their Maithili native speakers. Tharu

No research has been carried out to compare request forms in English and Tharu. So, the present study is different from the above reviewed studies in terms of language and topic because the present study focuses on ‘request forms’ in the Tharu language.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study are as follows:

- (i) to find out request forms in the Tharu language,
- (ii) to compare and contrast request forms of Tharu with those of English, and
- (iii) to provide some pedagogical implications.

1.4 Significance of the Study

There are some research works conducted on the Tharu language in the Department of English Education but no attempt has been made to compare the request forms of English Tharu. So, this work will be a valuable for the Department itself. The study will be beneficial to all those who are interested in the English and Tharu languages. It will be equally important for the teachers who are teaching English as a foreign language where there are Tharu native speakers. It will be beneficial to the curriculum designers, linguists, teachers, students and textbook writers.

1.5 Definitions of the Specific Terms

Some specific terms which are used in this study are defined as follows:

Request: This term refers to the statement that expresses politeness explicitly.

Responses: They refer to all the answers of the questionnaires in the given social settings.

Direct request: It deals with the responses in which polite terms are used.

Indirect requests: These responses which are not in the form of politeness but they express the requests to some extent.

Honorific: Politeness formulas in a particular language which may specific affixes, words or sentence structure.

Non-requests: All the other responses are out of direct and indirect. They are impolite responses which don't express requests explicitly.

Pedagogy: This term refers to science of teaching.

Socio-Pragmatics: This term refers to the proper use of form and functions with appropriate meaning according to the context.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

The researcher followed the following methodology to accomplish the objectives.

2.1 Sources of Data

The researcher collected data from both primary and secondary sources.

2.1.1 Primary Sources

The researcher collected required data from the native speakers of the Tharu language of Saptari and Siraha districts.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources

The secondary sources of this research were various books, dictionaries, journals, articles and unpublished theses, e.g. Chomsky (1957), Van Ek (1977), Matreyek (1983), Pandey (1997), Crystal (2003), Khanal (2004), Chaudhary (2005), Kumar (2006), Levinson (1983), Chaudhary (2064), Leech (1982), etc.

2.2 Population of the Study

The sample population of the study consisted of 80 Tharu native speakers who are living at Saptari and Siraha districts.

2.3 Sampling Procedure

The total population was divided into two groups i.e. educated and uneducated. Educated were those who have academic qualification above S.L.C. level and those who are below S.L.C. level were considered as uneducated population. Out of 80 people, forty were educated and equal

number of uneducated people were selected. Likewise, among the 40, there were 20 males and the equal number of the female informants. The researcher used stratified random sampling procedure to sample the population. The following table shows the respondents of the study:

Table No. 1
Population of the study

Detail	Male	Female	Total
Educated	20	20	40
Uneducated	20	20	40
Grand Total	40	40	80

2.4 Tools for Data Collection

The main tools for the collection of data were the questionnaire and interview schedule. The questionnaire was given to the educated respondents and the interview schedule was used to elicit data from uneducated people. The informants were supposed to act out different relationship as friends, strangers, students/teachers/professors, relatives, customers/shopkeepers, patients/doctors and neighbours. All the respondents were from Saptari and Siraha districts. There were 28 items of discourse altogether (See appendix I).

2.5 Process of Data Collection

After preparing the questionnaire and interview schedule, the researcher visited the population, the Tharu native speakers of Saptari and Siraha districts. He individually met the informants and established rapport with them. He explained the purpose of the study. He conducted interview with uneducated population according to the prepared interview schedule

and wrote their responses in the sheets of interview questionnaire. Educated population was handed over the sheets of questionnaire to respond English or Nepali situations into their native or mother tongue equivalence. He also explained the questionnaire, if necessary.

At last, the questionnaires were collected and analyzed using simple statistical tools of average and percentage.

2.6 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study were as follows:

- (i) This study was confined to the comparison between Tharu and English request forms.
- (ii) The study focused only on the request forms in Tharu language with reference to English
- (iii) The total population was confined only two groups viz: educated and uneducated having 40 informants in each group.
- (iv) The study was further limited to the analysis of the responses obtained from the 80 respondents only.
- (v) This study was based only on Saptaria dialect of the Tharu language.

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained from the informants and secondary sources. All the responses of Tharu speakers were tabulated on the basis of direct requests, indirect requests and non-requests. As this study is comparative in nature, request forms in Saptaria dialect of Tharu are listed, compared and contrasted with those of English to find out whether these two languages have equivalent request forms and the rules or not.

3.1 Request Forms in the Tharu Language

Request is the matter of respect. It was developed by “Bhotbarmeli and Aagneya families” (Chapagain, 2002, p. 5). Before these families, there was no existence of respect. The one reason which helped to develop respect can be taken to royal family of Nepal.

In the Tharu language, the personal pronouns and their distinctions in number and honorificity are given below:

Table No. 2
Request Forms in the Tharu Language

Persons	Number	
	Singular	Plural
1 st	h m	h m-s b/sun
2 nd Honorific	p ne	p ne-s b/sun
Non-Honorific	hâ tu/to/tuhe	hâ-s b/sun tu/to/huhe-s b/sun
3 rd	u i	u-s b/sun i-s b/sun

3.2 Total Forms of Request Given by the Tharu

Table No. 3

Total Responses used by Tharu Speakers

TSs	DR		IdR		Non-R	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
	1294	57.77	281	12.54	665	29.69

The above tables show that the native speakers of Tharu are less polite than the English native speakers. Out of 2240 responses, the Tharu native speakers used 57.77% direct request, 29.69% non-requests and 12.54% indirect requests whereas English native speakers used 68% direct requests, 24% non-request forms and 7.80% indirect requests. Some examples from the Tharu language are:

1. k nhik h m ra m d t k ir den . (S.No. 2)
(Please help me.)
2. kripya, h m ra yi kitab aindiy une. (S.No. 21)
(Please, bring me this book.)

In this way, the researcher found 12.54% indirect requests in the Tharu language. In these responses, polite terms are not used but the forms of sentences express requests indirectly. Some examples are:

3. h u, h m r bari d ne pera n i l gya diy u.
(I want you not to walk in my land.)
4. s m y k ih dety i t ?
(Is it all right to tell the time?)

In these above mentioned responses, the respondents expressed their requests indirectly. They did not use polite terms here but the sentences

expressed requests to some extent. So, these types of responses are classified in indirect requests.

The other responses are categorized under non requests. Over 29% responses were of these types in Tharu. For example:

5. kebar khol. (S.No. 3)
(Open the door.)
6. k ni h m ra ek gila:s pain det . (S.No. 26)
(Give me a glass of water.)

The respondents are not polite to respond the situation. An important point is that the number of non-requests in Tharu is far greater than those of the English language. It shows that native speakers of Tharu were seen less polite than the native speakers of English while responding to the situation. But in fact, it does not mean that Tharu people are not polite. It has been found from the study that Tharu people expressed their requests from their tone, facial expression and other tactics.

3.2.1 Total Forms of Request Found between Friends

Table No. 4

Total Responses Used by Friends

NSs	S.No.	DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Tharu	1, 2, 13, 19, 21, 26, 28, 23	384	60	32	5	224	35

In the cases of Tharu native speakers, more direct forms of request were found. They used the least number of indirect requests. Out of 640 responses, 60% were direct requests, 35% were non-requests and 5% were indirect requests. They used more direct requests to their friends. Some examples are:

1. k nik p n kard diy ne. (S.No. 1)
(Please, give me your library card.)
2. k ni khat utha diy n . (S.No. 2)
(Please, lift the bed.)

Tharu people used more non-requests than indirect requests and less than direct requests. Some examples are:

3. k ni to âp n kard de t ? (S.No. 1)
(Give me your card.)
4. k ni khat utha det . (S.No. 2)
(Lift the bed.)
5. h m ra ek gilâs pain det . (S.No. 26)
(Give me a glass of water.)
6. i sika urot n ipiy i t . (S.No. 28)
(Don't smoke cigarette here.)

The total requests used by Tharu informants in the relationship of friends are as follows:

Table No. 5
Request Forms in the Friend-Friend Relationship

S.N.	DR by TSs	F	%
1. kard diyau.	85	13.28
2.	k nhik/ekr ti Kha:t utha diy ut .	45	7.03
3.	y u k nhik/ekr ti pain diy t .	71	11.09
4.	y u tiket k tabun .	5	0.78
5. diy .	5	0.78
6.	h u pain dyat .	24	3.75
7.	vaiji ekr ti law n .	8	1.25
8.	K nhik piya:bun .	14	2.18
9.	âhake se likh b.	16	2.5
10.	kirpy	20	8.12
11.	hey u m ð t k run /diy u t .	12	1.88
12. pen diyau ki.	11	1.71
13.	y udiyaun .	43	6.71
14.	kirpya s hyog k ru.	25	3.90
IdR by TSs			
15.	k nhik ra d ile s kai iyai?	14	2.18
16.	k nhik ra piyaithi?	3	0.48
17. n i pithi se nik r h t i.	7	1.09
18. pain laib del jau.	3	0.48
19.	p ne n i piu/piy l jau.	5	0.78

From the above table, it was found that the Tharu people used following words as direct requests. They are ekr ti/k nhik, y u, h u, hake, etc. at the beginning of the sentences and diy u, diy t , likh b, diy u ki, k ru etc. as the forms of verb.

In the same way, d ile s k i iy i, diy , piyaithi, se nik r h tai, del jau, piy l jau etc. were used in indirect requests as the forms of the verb. It proved that there were some words (above the table) which functioned as politeness.

3.2.2 Total Forms of Request Found between Strangers

Table No. 6
Total Responses Used by Strangers

NSs	S.No.	DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Tharu	7, 10, 12, 15, 25	228	57	56	14	116	29

The table given above shows that a stranger speaking to another was found to be more polite than a friend speaking to another friend in the Tharu language. There were 400 responses between strangers. Out of those, 57% were direct requests, 14% were indirect requests and 29% were non-requests. Some examples of direct requests are given below:

1. y u, ai dinse ibate n i l ru. (S.No. 7)
(Hello, don't walk in this way.)
2. kripya k nhik s m y k ih den . (S.No. 10)
(Please, tell me time.)
3. k nhik khirki kholut . (S.No. 12)
(Please, open the window.)
4. k nhik ra uthya diy n. (S.No. 15)
(Please, give me your hand.)
5. h y u ! k nhik ra h m ro cycle se lene lu n . (S.No. 25)
(Excuse me! Please lift me.)

Tharu people used less indirect forms of request in comparison to direct requests. They used more requests with strangers in comparison of friends. Some examples are as follows:

6. h u h m r bari ð ne pera n i l g ðiy u. (S.No. 7)
(Excuse me! I want you not to walk in this way.)
7. S m y k ih detiyai t ? (S.No. 10)
(Do you tell me the time?)

The total requests used by Tharu language speakers in the relationship between strangers are given below:

Table No. 7

List of Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Strangers

S.N.	DR by TSs	F	%
1.	y ha k nhik ra diy un /kholun .	70	17.5
2. ðiy u/ðiy .	50	12.5
3.	kripya	36	9
4. diy ne.	18	3.25
5. s hyog kair den .	16	4
6. k ir den .	20	5
7.	he y u lene lun .	10	2.5
8. lya jeb i/ alune.	8	2
9. vel i h u?	5	1.25
IdR by TSs			
10.	h u k nhik d h kn	18	4.5
11. kholal jya/jai.	15	3.75
12. Khoil s k i iy i.	5	1.25
13. khoil dety i	12	3
14. dh rm hety i	2	0.5
15. n i l ryo.	4	1

From above table, the researcher found that the Tharu language speakers used a few terms of indirect requests while they were speaking with strangers. It views that Tharu language speakers are not rich in their indirect forms of request.

3.2.3 Total Forms of Requests Found between Students and Teachers

Table No. 8
Total Responses Used by Teachers and Students

N Ss	S.No.	DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Tharu	8, 9, 14	144	60	42	17.5	54	22.5

There has always been a very cordial relationship between a teacher and students in this part of the world. Students are found to be more polite to their teachers.

The above table states that the Tharu language speakers responded 60% direct requests, 22.5% non-requests and 17.5% indirect requests out of the two hundred and forty responses. Some responses of direct requests are as follows:

1. h m r sodhpatra s yadiy . (S.No. 14)
(Please, correct my thesis.)
2. hâ lek h dyake s hyog k ir diy . (S.No. 9)
(Kindly, help me giving your article.)
3. kripya h m r sodhpatra s yadiy u. (S.No. 14)
(Please, correct my thesis.)

4. h m r sodhp tr s yad ike lagi nurodh k r i i. (S.No. 14)
(I request you to correct my thesis.)
5. hâse ELT p trika h paile s hyog mang i i. (S.No. 9)
(I request you to publish ELT journal.)

However, Tharu people used the least number of indirect forms of requests in comparison to direct requests. Some examples of indirect forms of requests are as follows:

6. guruji, ELT p trika h paile s hyog kyadel jau. (S.No. 9)
(Guruji, help to publish ELT journal.)
7. h m r thesis s ya dety i t hâke vari hetiy i. (S.No. 14)
(I'll be grateful to you if you check my first draft of thesis.)
8. h m r sodhp tr s yadel jaun . (S.No. 14)
(Sir/Madam, check my thesis.)

The students and teachers used the least number of non-request forms on the comparison of other Tharu responses (friends to friends, and strangers to strangers). Some examples are as follows:

9. Sir, ELT p trikame s hyog k ir de. (S.No. 9)
(Sir, help me to publish ELT journal.)
10. Sir, h m r sodhp tr dekh d h i. (S.No. 14)
(Sir, correct my thesis.)
11. master saheb, k nhik ra s hyog k ir det . (S.No. 9)
(Sir, help me.)

Table No. 9
List of Total Request Forms in the Context of Student-Teacher Relationship

S.N.	DR by TSs	F	%
1. s yadiy .	48	12.5
2.s hyog k ir diy u.	18	5
3. nurodh k r i i.	9	6.25
4. s hyog m ng i i.	12	3.75
5. diy u.	24	13.75
6. diy une.	9	3.75
7. diy .	12	7.5
8.	kripya	9	3.75
9. diy un .	3	3.75
IdR by TSs			
10. s hyog kyadel jau.	14	8.75
11. vari hety i.	10	3.75
12. del jaun .	7	2.5
13. dety i t kehen hety i.	11	2.5

The research shows that Tharu language speakers used 60% direct requests and 17.5% indirect requests in the relation to student and teacher.

3.2.4 Total Forms of Request Found Between Relatives

Table No. 10
Total Responses used by Relatives

NSs	S.No.	DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Tharu	3, 5, 17, 27, 18	210	52.5	55	13.75	135	33.75

The above table indicates that the Tharu language speakers used 52.5% direct requests, 33.75% non-requests and 13.75% indirect requests out of four hundred. They show their request by tone, facial expressions and other activities while expressing to their relatives. Some examples of direct requests are as follows:

1. m inya k nhik kebar khoilden . (S.No. 3)
(Mum, Please open the door.)
2. babu h m ra b zarse s man laib di . (S.NO. 5)
(Please, help me to bring goods from the market.)
3. babu h m ra filim dekhaile jaile den . (S.No. 17)
(Let me watch the movie.)
4. la: kaki, h m paidh dai iyau. (S.No. 27)
(Exceuse me, aunt, I'll read the news for you.)

In the same way, it was found that Tharu people were less polite and use less indirect request while they were speaking to their relatives. It depended on their tones, gestures, activities. Some examples of indirect requests are as below:

5. h tiya jyake s man anty i t kehen het i? (S.No. 5)
(How will it be if you bring goods from the market?)
6. m inya! Kebar k nhik ra khoil dety i t ? (S.No. 3)
(Is it all right to open the door, mum?)
7. kaki, h m patrika p idh dya s kai iy i. (S.No. 27)
(Can I read the newspaper to you.)

On the other hand, out of 320 responses, 33.75% were categorized in non-requests. They were very informal while responding to the situations with their parents. Some examples of non-requests used by Tharu people are as follows:

8. m inya g i kebar khoildene. (S.No. 3)
(Open the door, mother.)
9. tu b zaar se s man laib den . (S.No. 5)
(Bring the goods from the market.)
10. babu, h m sinema dekh ile jai iy u. (S.No. 17)
(I am going to watch the movie.)

Table No. 11

List of Total Request Forms in the Context of Relatives

S.N.	DR by TSs	F	%
1.	m inya khoil den .	50	12.5
2. laib diy .	42	10.5
3. d i iyau.	25	6.25
4. laib debai.	26	6.5
5. diy u.	25	6.25
6. ain dih .	20	5
7. laib d h i.	22	5.5
IdR by TSs			
8. anty i t kehen hetyai.	10	2.5
9. khoil dety i t .	15	3.75
10. dya s kai iyai.	30	7.5

From the above table, it shows that Tharu language speakers used only least number of indirect requests. It is culture specific that Tharu people did not show requests to their parents.

3.2.5 Total Forms of Request Found Between Customers and Shopkeepers

Table No. 12
Total Responses used by Customers and Shopkeepers

NSs	S.No.	DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Tharu	4, 11, 24	132	55	48	20	60	25

From the above table, it was found that the majority of Tharu informants responded the situation very politely. They used more direct forms of requests than indirect requests. Fifty five percent responses in Tharu were direct requests. Some examples of direct requests are as follows:

1. k nhik s m y ke lel s man raikh diy u. (S.No. 4)
(Please, keep the goods for sometimes.)
2. kripya, h m ra yi kitab aindiy une. (S.No. 28)
(Please, bring me this book.)
3. Freez gh rt k pugaike lagi h m ra s hyog k ru. (S.No. 11)
(Help me to deliver refrigerator at home.)

Out of 240 responses, 20% were indirect requests which expressed politeness indirectly in Tharu language. Some examples are as follows:

4. h m r s mans b dekhdeb i t h m ra ku h h lka m hsus hety i.
(If you watch my goods, I will feel easy.)
5. yi friz gh rt ik pugya dety i t nik hety i? (S.No. 11)
(Is it ok if you deliver this refrigerator to home?)
6. yi kitab m ngya del jau? (S.No. 24)
(Is it possible to bring me this book?)

Twenty-five percent of responses in Tharu were categorized in non-requests. They did not express politeness. Some examples are given below:

7. ur s man nikse raikh d h i. (S.No. 4)
(keep some goods safely.)
8. yi friz gh rt ik pugyade. (S.No. 11)
(Deliver this refrigerator to home.)
9. h m r lel yi kitab ainde. (S.No. 24)
(Bring this book for me.)

Table No. 13

List of Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Customers and Shopkeepers

S.N.	DR by TSs	F	%
1.	k nhik diy u.	36	15
2. diy une.	24	10
3. s hyog k ru	12	5
4. diy un .	18	7.5
5. diy u t .	6	2.5
6. di .	6	2.5
7. den .	9	3.75
8.	kripya laibdeb i.	18	7.5
9. k ir diy ne.	3	1.25
IdR by TSs			
10. dety i t nik hety i.	9	3.75
11. deljau?	18	7.5
12. S k i iy i?	12	5
13. deljao ki?	9	3.75

It has been found that Tharu people used more direct request and less indirect request in the relationship of customers and shopkeepers.

3.2.6 Total Forms of Request Found Between Patients and Doctors

Table No. 14

Total Forms of Request Found Between Patients and Doctors

NSs	S.No.	DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Tharu	20	52	65	12	15	16	20

The above table shows that Tharu people used 65% direct requests out of eighty responses. They used more polite responses in the relationship of patients and doctors. Some examples of them are as follows:

1. d kt r s heb! h m ra up ar k ir di . (S.No. 20)
(Please, check my health.)
2. kripya nikse up r k irdiy u. (S.No. 20)
(Please check me.)

In the same way, Tharu people used less indirect forms of requests in relationship of patient and doctor. Only 15% of responses were used as indirect requests by Tharu speakers. They used indirect requests differently to the doctor. Some examples are given below:

3. p ne up a:r kyal deljai. (S.No. 20)
(Is it possible to check my health?)
4. h m ra up ar k irdety i t p neke gun k ihiyone bisr ty i.
(I'll remember forever if you check my health.)

On the other hand, there were 20% responses under non-requests. These responses did not show requests. Some examples are as follows:

5. h m r jai de. (S.No. 20)
(Check my health.)

6. h m r bira:mi thik k ir de t . (S.No. 20)
(Check my health.)

The total requests provided by Tharu speakers in the relationship of doctors and patients are as follows:

Table No. 15
Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Patients and Doctors

S.N.	DR by TSs	F	%
1.	dakt r saheb..... k ir di .	12	15
2.	kripya k ir diy u.	9	11.25
3.	b idhyji	8	10
4. diy une.	10	12
5. diy un .	6	7.5
6. diy n .	7	8.75
IdR by TSs			
7.	p ne kyal deljai/r ty i	5	6.25
8. deljau.	4	5
9. hety i.	3	3.75

From the table above, it was found that most of the responses were polite in the Tharu language. Majority of the Tharu respondents used direct requests while responding to the situations with the doctors.

3.2.7 Total Request Forms Found in the Relationship of Neighbours

Table No. 16
Total Responses Used by Neighbours

NSs	S.No.	DR		IdR		Non-R	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Tharu	6, 16, 22	144	60	36	15	60	25

The table given above indicates that sixty percent of responses were expressed in the form of direct requests by Tharu language speakers. They used very polite terms in their responses. Some examples of them are as follows:

1. isiki kh s ut n i fek i ki? (S.No. 6)
(Please, don't throw the garbage here.)
2. kripya, h m ra kuch rup iya s hyog kair diyau.
(Please, help me with some money.)
3. ha p n j gga dyake s hyog k rune. (S.No. 22)
(Please, help me to use your land.)

There were 15% of responses categorized in indirect requests by Tharu speakers. Tharu people used 15% indirect form of requests in the relationship of neighbours. Some of the examples are as follows:

4. i sika kh s ut n i feky i t kehen hety i? (S.No. 6)
(How will it be if you don't throw the garbage here?)
5. k nhik p isa deb it t klip n ine? (S.No. 16)
(Do you mind giving me some money?)
6. hake j min pr yog k rlase kono t klip n ine hyat? (S.No. 22)
(Would you mind if I use your land?)

On the other hand, there were some other responses used in these situations. They were impolite. They did not express requests. So, these responses were recorded under non-requests category. Some examples are given below:

7. r i hora! ithna kh s ut n i fek i. (S.No. 6)
(Hey boy! Don't throw the garbage here.)

8. h m ra rup iya dene. (S.No. 16)
(Give me money.)
9. tuhe p n j min pr yog k re debhi? (S.No. 22)
(Can I use your land?)

The total requests used by Tharu speakers in the relationship with their neighbours are as follows:

Table No. 17
Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Neighbours

S.N.	DR by TLSs	F	%
1. n i fek i ki?	30	12.5
2. s hyog k ir diy u.	18	7.5
3. k rune.	15	6.25
4. agr h k r i.	12	5
5. diy u.	21	8.75
6. diy /k re di .	18	7.5
7.	kripya.....	15	6.25
8. diy ne.	9	3.75
9. deb i.	6	2.5
IdR by TLSs			
10. t kehen hety i?	12	5
11. t t klip n ine?	4	1.67
12. Kono t klip n ine hyat?	2	0.83
13. dya s k i iy i?	15	6.25
14. s hyog k re p rt i.	3	1.25

From the above table, it shows that Tharu speakers used more direct form of requests than indirect form of requests.

3.3 Total Request Forms of the Native Speakers of Tharu in the Item-wise Relationship

Table No. 18
Total Request Forms Used by Tharu Native Speakers in Item-Wise Relationship

TLSs	DR		IdR		Non-R	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Friends/friends	384	17.14	32	1.42	224	10
Strangers/strangers	228	10.17	56	2.5	116	5.17
Students/teachers	144	6.42	42	1.87	54	2.41
Relatives	210	9.37	55	2.45	135	6.02
Customers/shopkeepers	132	5.89	48	2.14	60	2.67
Patients/doctors	52	2.32	12	0.53	16	0.71
Neighbours/neighbours	144	6.42	36	1.6	60	2.67
Total	1294	57.77	281	12.54	665	29.69

From the table given above, majority of the Tharu informants used more direct forms of requests. Out of 2240 total responses, 57.77 % were direct requests and 12.54 % were indirect requests while responding to the situations. According to the table, they used 29.69 % non-request forms.

3.4 Total Request Forms of Educated and Uneducated Tharu Speakers

Table No. 19
Total Request Forms of Educated and Uneducated Tharu Speakers

TSs	DR		IdR		Non-R	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Educated	700	62.5	168	15	252	22.5
Uneducated	616	55	28	2.5	476	42.5
Total						

From the table given above, it shows that the Tharu educated speakers used 62.5% direct requests and 15% indirect requests whereas the Tharu uneducated speakers used 55% direct requests and 2.5% indirect requests out of 1120. So, the educated Tharu speakers used more direct requests and indirect requests than the uneducated Tharu speakers. The uneducated Tharu speakers used 42.5% non-request forms whereas the educated Tharu speakers used 22.5 % non- request forms.

It was found that the educated Tharu speakers used more request forms than the uneducated Tharu speakers.

3.5 Comparison between the Request Forms of Tharu and those of English

During this study, the researcher did not find any request forms of written book in Tharu. Only the data collected from 80 native speakers of Tharu were the sole source of request regarding the Tharu. The researcher used request forms of English from the book “Communicating in English” written by W. Matreyek in 1983. In this sub unit, the researcher has compared the request forms of the Tharu language with those of English. All the request forms of language on the basis of two different criteria viz. direct request and indirect request are separately compared as below:

3.5.1 Comparison of Direct Request

Both the Tharu and English languages have request forms which are compared with those of English and similarities and differences are found as below:

Table No. 20
Comparison of Direct Request

DR by TNLs	DR by ENLs
1. h ke pense likh b?	1. Can I write with your pen?
2. kripya h ap n libr ri kard diy n.	2. Please, give me your library card.
3. ek gilās h m ra pain laib diy u, ki?	3. Bring me a glass of water, will you?
4. y u, khirki khoil diy .	4. Hello, please open the window.
5. k nhik/ekr ti uthya diy n.	5. Please, lift me.
6. kripya ethna kh s ut n i k ir diy u.	6. Please, don't throw the garbage here.

Both the Tharu and English languages have request forms but they are different in their forms and structures. In English, at the beginning of the sentences, they used please, + v¹, can I + v¹, v¹ + please, etc. In the same way, Tharu people used kripya, k nhik ra, y u etc. at the beginning of the sentence. So, please in English and kripya or k nhik ra in Tharu are used as request forms according to their own sentence structures. Thus, please and kripya or k nhik ra are similar in their word forms. In this way, it was found that they are request forms.

3.5.2 Comparison of Indirect Request

Table No. 21

Comparison of Indirect Request

DR by TNLs	DR by ENLs
1. h u, h m r bari d ne pera n i l gya diy u.	1. I want you not to walk in my land.
2. s m y k ih dety i t ?	2. Is it all right to tell the time?
3. Guruji, ELT p trika me s hyog kel deljau.	3. It is better to help in ELT journal.
4. h m thesis s yo dety i t h m hake vari hety i.	4. I will be grateful to you if you correct my thesis.
5. h tya jyake s man onty i t kehen hety i?	5. How is it if you bring goods from the market?
6. m inya yi kebar k nhik ra khoil dety i t ?	6. Is it all right to open the door, mum?
7. h m r s mans b dekh deb i t h m ra ku h h lka m hsus hety i.	7. I'll feel easy if you watch my goods.
8. h m ra up ar k ir dety i t p neke gun k hiyone bisr tiy i.	8. I'll remember forever if you check my health.
9. h ke j min pr yog k rlase kono t klip n ine hyat?	9. Do you mind borrowing to use your land?

Both the Tharu and English languages have their own indirect requests with distinct markers. In Tharu, indirect request begins with different markers i.e. h u, h m r, p ne etc. and its pattern is started in above table, e.g. ' p ne kyadeljau' whereas in English, indirect request begins within following patterns e.g. I want you not to, Is it all right, Is it ok if you deliver?, etc. Thus, these patterns of Tharu and English refer to politeness of indirect request.

3.5 Total Request Forms of Native Speakers of Tharu

Table No. 22

Total Request Forms Used by Tharu Language Speakers

S.N.	DR by TSs	F	%
1.	kripya	107	4.77
2.	K nhik/ekr ti diy u t .	51	2.27
3.	Y u, k nhik/ekr ti diy t .	71	3.16
4. diy .	83	3.70
5.	H u diy t .	24	1.07
6. den /diy u	369	16.47
7.	Y u k tabun .	5	0.22
8.	vaiji labun .	8	0.35
9.	hake se likh b.	16	0.71
10.	hey u k run /diy u t .	37	1.65
11. diy u ki.	11	0.49
12.	y u diy n /diy un .	126	5.62
13. s hyog k ru/k ir diy u.	92	4.10
14. diy ne.	65	2.90
15. k ir den .	20	0.89
16. deb i/lya jeb i.	40	1.78
17. vel i h u.	5	0.22
18. nurodh/agr h k r i i.	31	1.80
19. d i iy u	25	1.11
20. ain dih .	20	0.89
21. d h i	22	0.98
22.	dakt r sahib k ir diy .	12	0.53
23.	b idhji	10	0.44
24. n i fek i ki.	30	1.33
25.	k nhik piyabun .	14	0.62

IdR by TSs			
26. d ile s k i iy i?	76	3.40
27. Piyathi?	3	0.13
28. se nik r ht i/hety i	19	0.84
29. deljau.	42	1.88
30. piy l jau.	5	0.22
31.	h u d h kn .	18	0.80
32. khol l jya.	15	0.64
33. khoil dety i/t .	27	1.20
34. dh rm hety .	12	0.53
35. n i l ryo.	4	0.17
36. t kehen hety i.	33	1.47
37. del jau ki?	13	0.58
38. kya del jai/r ht i	5	0.22
39. t t klip n ine.	4	0.17
40. kono t klip n ine hyat.	2	0.09
41. s hyog k re p rt i	3	0.13

Out of 2240 total responses, only 281 were indirect and 1294 were direct forms of requests used by Tharu people. There were twenty-five types of direct requests found in the Tharu language and sixteen types of indirect requests.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the findings of the research along with some recommendations for pedagogical implications.

4.1 Findings

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the collected data, the major findings of the present study are summarized in the following points:

4.1.1 Request Forms in Tharu

The request forms in Tharu are as follows:

- a) k nhik r ,ekr ti , h u , h , y u, kripya etc are used in the beginning of sentence while making requests in Tharu.
- b) l b n , diy , diy u, diy n , aindih , deljau, s k i iy i, piy ljau, khol l jy , dh rm hety , deljau ki , kya deljai, etc are used as in verbs while making requests in Tharu.
- c) In totally, 57.77% of Tharu native speakers used direct requests.
- d) Tharu native speakers used 12.54% indirect requests.
- e) The Tharu people used 60 % direct requests among friends.
- f) Fifty seven percent of Tharu speakers used direct requests among strangers.
- g) The Tharu speakers used 60 % direct requests between the students and teachers.
- h) Some utterances of Tharu do not seem to be as request forms but they use as request forms according to their tones.

- i) The Tharu speakers used 52.5% of direct requests among relatives.
- j) The Tharu speakers used 55% direct requests between customers and shopkeepers.
- k) The Tharu speakers used 65% direct requests between patients and doctors.
- l) Sixty percent of the Tharu speakers used direct requests among neighbours.
- m) Educated Tharu people used more direct requests (i.e. 62.5%) than uneducated Tharu.

4.1.2 Similarities and Differences between Request Forms in the Tharu and English Languages

- a) Both Saptaria dialect of Tharu and English have direct-indirect request forms.
- b) Both Tharu and English are different in their forms and structures.
- c) The Tharu people have limited codes to use request forms but English has many.
- d) Tharu native speakers were less polite than English native speakers.
- e) Twenty five different types of direct requests and sixteen types of requests were found in the Tharu language whereas sixteen different types of request forms were found in English.

4.2 Recommendations

On the basis of findings obtained from the analysis of the collected data, the recommendations have been made as below:

- a. Request forms in Saptaria dialect of Tharu are more or less different with those of English. So, language teachers who are teaching Tharu as a second language should be aware of this fact.
- b. The main aim of this comparative study was to find out request forms and to compare and contrast the ones of Tharu with those of the English language. There would be no problem in the areas where the two languages are similar but differences between the two languages create difficulty in the target language. Therefore, teaching should be focused on the areas of difficulty.
- c. The teacher can create dialogues that require the expressions of requests and perform them in the situations.
- d. Make the students know all the requests in English and Tharu. Then ask them to list all the polite forms of requests in these languages which are functionally similar. And find out the requests which are different from one to another language and make them learn in the given situations.
- e. Students can listen to what people say around them during situations that require expression of requests.
- f. Students can make note of what people say when they ask someone to do something.
- g. Learners can create the situations mentioned in the appendix I and appendix II and make them practice in those situations. They can

also note them how people respond to them when they encounter such situations.

- h. The learner of the Tharu language can make a list of requests from the situations and compare with those of English.
- i. Learners can watch Tharu films. They can take notes as to how people request to each other.
- j. The teacher can use a comic strip such as asking for help from others and respond the situation in requests.
- k. The teacher can create situations based on these forms of requests and ask the students to make requests properly.
- l. Text-book writers should write books that the learner can be encouraged to use them in their conversations.

The researcher does not claim that the present study is sufficient to find out all the request forms of the Tharu language. So, there may appear other forms of requests as well as the arrival of different Tharu scholars in the near future. The present study is mainly based on the data collected from eighty Tharu native speakers of Saptari and Siraha districts.

However, the researcher has tried his best to generalize the forms of requests in Tharu explicitly based on the collected data.

Finally, the researcher wants to request the concerned authority to take the above mentioned recommendations into consideration. Further more, he would like to request, the authority to carry out other researchers on the various areas of the Tharu language.

References

- Aarts, F. and Aarts, J.(1986). *English syntactic structure*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Asher, R.E. et al. (1994). *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Austin, J.L.(1962) *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, Mass: HUP.
- Chapagain, G. (2002). *A comparative study of request forms in the English and Nepali languages*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu. Tribhuvan University.
- Chaudhary, B. (2057 B.S.). *Tharu dastawej (Tharu language preservation)*. Saptari: Karyapatra.
- Chaudhary, K.K(2008). *Pluralization in the Tharu and English languages*. An unpublished M.Ed.Thesis. Kathmandu. T.U.
- Chaudhary, M. (2005). *A sketch grammar of saptaria tharu*. An Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Kathmandu. T.U.
- Chaudhary, M. (2064 V.S.). *Nepalko terai tatha yasko bhumiputra-haru*. Dang: GMBS.
- Chaudhary, R.P.(2008). *Verbal affixation in Tharu and English*. An unpublished M.Ed.Thesis. Kathmandu. T.U.
- Chomsky, (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Corder, S.Pit. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. Harmondsworth : Penguin.
- Fraser, B. (1980). An apologizing. In F. Colum as (ed.): *Conversation Routines*. The Hague: Mouton.

- Fries, C.C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*.
Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Goody, N.E. (1978). *Questions and politeness*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics*. London: OUP.
- Hornby, A.S. (2000). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*, (6th Edition.)
London : OUP.
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive analysis*. London: Longman.
- Katwal,N.(2006).*English and Tharu kinship terms*. An Unpublished
M.Ed.Thesis. Kathmandu. T.U
- Khanal, G.P. (2004). *A comparative study on the forms of address of the
Tharu and English languages*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis,
Kathmandu.T.U.
- Kumar, R. (2006). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor, MI: University
of Michigan Press.
- Law, J. (2006). *Oxford language reference*. London: OUP.
- Leech, G. (1982). *Principle of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mahato,R.(2001).*Subject-verb agreement in Tharru and English*. An
Unpublished M.Ed.Thesis. Kathmandu. T.U
- Matreyek, W. (1983). *Communicating in English*. New York: Pergamon
Press.
- Pandey, (1997). *A comparative study of apologies between English and
Nepali Languages*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu.
T.U.

- Rai, V.S. (2005). *Psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics*. Kathmandu: Bhundipuram Prakashan.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Sthapit, S.K. (1978). The role of contrastive analysis and error analysis in second language teaching. *Education Quarterly*, Institute of Education, Tribhuvan University.
- Van Ek and Alexander (1980). *Threshold level*. London: Council for Europe.
- Varsheny, R.L., et al. (2000). *An introductory textbook of linguistics and phonetics*. Bareilly: Student Store.
- Wilkins, D.A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: OUP.
- Yadav, S. (2008). *A comparative study of request forms in the English and Maithili languages*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu. Tribhuvan University.
- Yadava, Y.P. (2001). *Linguistics: A basic course*. Kathmandu: New Hira Books Enterprises.

APPENDIX – I

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE / QUESTIONNAIRE

This interview schedule/questionnaire has been prepared in order to accomplish a research work entitled "A Comparative Study on Request Forms in Tharu and English". This research is being carried out under the guidance of Ass. Lecturer, Mrs. Hima Rawal, Department of English Education, Faculty of Education, T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu. It is hoped that your kind co - operation will be a great contribution in the accomplishment of this valuable research.

Researcher

Rama Nand Chaudhary
Department of English Education
T.U. Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Name (नाम) : Sex (लिंग) :

District (जिल्ला) :

Academic Qualification (शैक्षिक योग्यता) :

Make requests for these situations in the Tharu Language.

1. You have forgotten your library card at your room and you have to borrow a book from the library. Ask your friend to help in that situation. (तपाईंले आफ्नो पुस्तकालय कार्ड कोठामा विर्सनु भएछ र पुस्तकालयबाट किताब भिक्नुपर्ने छ । तपाईंले साथीलाई त्यस अवस्थामा सहयोग गर्न भन्नुहोस् ।)

.....

2. You are unable to move your sleeping bed alone. Ask a fellow worker for help. (तपाईंले सुत्ने खाट एकलैले उचाल्न सक्नुभएन । आफ्नो साथीलाई सहयोगको लागि अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)

.....

3. You are carrying a bundle of clothes. Ask your mother to open the door. (तपाईंले धेरै लुगा लगिराख्नु भएको छ ? ढोका खोल्न आमालाई भन्नुहोस् ।
.....
4. You bought many things from a shop, which you can not carry at a time. You leave some of them in the shop and ask the shopkeeper for a favor to take care of your goods until you come. (तपाईंले एउटा पसलबाट धेरै सामानहरु खरिद गर्नुभयो जुन एकैसाथ लैजान निकै कठिन पऱ्यो । केही समयको लागि आफ्नो सामान सुरक्षित राखिदिन पसलसंग अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।
.....
5. You have a bad headache but you have to go shopping for essential food stuffs for dinner. You ask your father for a favor to you. (तपाईंको टाउको दुःखेको छ तर तपाईंलाई बेलुकीको खानाको लागि आवश्यक सर-सामान किन्नको लागि बजार जानुपरेको छ । आफ्नो बुवालाई सहयोग गर्न अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
.....
6. Your neighbour often throws garbage in your courtyard. Once you saw it yourself. Ask him/her to promise not to do so in the future. (तपाईंको छिमेकीले प्रायजसो तपाईंको कम्पाउण्डमा फोहोर फालेको तपाईंले प्रत्यक्ष देख्नुभएको छ । आफ्नो छिमेकीलाई फोहोर नफालीदिन आग्रह गर्नुहोस् ।)
.....
7. Someone is trespassing in your garden. You request ask him not to do it again in the future. (तपाईंले आफ्नो वगैचामा हिड्नको लागि मनाही गर्नुभएको छ तर एकजना अपरिचित व्यक्ति त्यहि वगैचाबाट हिडिरहेको छ । अबदेखि त्यस वगैचाबाट नहिडिदिन ती अपरिचित व्यक्तिलाई अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
.....
8. Your student did not turn his/her homework on the scheduled date. Ask him/her to promise to do in the next day. (तपाईंको विद्यार्थीले समयमै गृहकार्य गर्दैन । भविष्यमा समयमै गर्न भन्नुहोस् ।)
.....

-
9. You and your friends are going to publish ELT journal. You need help from your teachers. (तिमी र तिम्रो साथीहरू ELT Journal प्रकाशन गर्न गइरहेका छौं । आफ्नो गुरुवर्गहरूसँग सहयोगका लागि अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
10. You lost your watch in the bus. You need to ask time to a stranger who is sitting near your seat. (तपाईंले बसमा आफ्नो घडी गुमाउनु भयो । एउटै सीटमा बसेको अपरिचीत यात्रूसँग समय सोध्नुहोस् ।)
-
11. You purchase a refrigerator from the shop. You want the shopkeeper to deliver it to the home. (तपाईंले किन्नुभएको फ्रीजलाई घरसम्म पुर्याउनको लागि पसलसँग सहयोगको लागि अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
12. You felt hot in the passenger bus. Ask unfamiliar passenger to open the window who is sitting near the window. (यात्रुबसमा तपाईंलाई गर्मी भयो । भ्याल नजिक बसेको अपरिचीत यात्रुलाई भ्याल खोल्न अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
13. You lost the purse in the campus. Ask your friends to help bus fare for returning home. (क्याम्पसमा पर्स हराउनु भयो । घर फर्कनको लागि बस भाडा सहयोग गर्न साथीलाई अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
14. There are many mistakes in your thesis. Ask your teacher to help by correcting the first draft of the thesis. (तपाईंको सोधपत्रमा धेरै त्रुटिहरू छन् । तपाईंले तयार पारेको पहिलो ड्राफ्ट छिटो सच्याएर सहयोग गरिदिनुहुन अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
15. While you are crossing road, you meet an accident with motorbike. Ask someone near you for a help. (बाटो काट्दै गर्दा तपाईंको खुट्टामा ठक्कर दियो र तपाईं लड्नुभयो । तपाईंको नजिकैको कसैसँग सहयोग माग्नुहोस् ।)

-
16. You have not enough money for the treatment. Ask your neighbour to help. (तपाईसँग आफ्नो उपचार गर्न पर्याप्त पैसानभएकोले छिमेकीसँग सहयोगको लागि अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
17. As you need permission from your father to see a new movie on the television Ask him for permission. (तपाईलाई नयाँ चलचित्र हेर्न जान मन लागको छ । आफ्नो वुबासँग अनुमति माग्नुहोस् ।)
-
18. You have an urgent work. Ask the chief of your office for a leave. (तपाईलाई अत्यन्त जरुरी काम परेको हुनाले कार्यालय प्रमुखलाई विदाको लागि अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
19. You bought the goods which are heavy. Ask your friend to help. (तपाईले किन्नुभएको समान गहुँगो छ । साथीलाई सहयोगको लागि अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
20. You are infected by 'cancer'. Ask the doctor to do a favor to you. (तपाईलाई क्यान्सर रोग लागेको छ । डाक्टरसँग उपचारको लागि अनुरोध गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
21. As your pen stops writing. You want to use your friend's pen. Ask him/his for permission. (तपाईको कलम लेख्दालेख्दै सकियो । उहाँवाट लेख्न अनुमति लिनुहोस् ।)
-
22. You need neighbour's land for your daughter's marriage. Ask permission with your neighbour. (आफ्नो छोरीको विवाह गर्न तपाईलाई छिमेकीको जग्गा आवश्यक पऱ्यो । आफ्नो छिमेकीसँग अनुमति माग्नुहोस् ।)
-

23. You want to invite your best friend for dinner tonight. Ask him/her for the dinner. (बेलुकीको खाना खान आउनको लागि आफ्नो साथीलाई निश्चित गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
24. You need some books which are not available in the shop. Ask shopkeeper to promise to bring them for you. (तपाईंलाई केहि कितावहरूको आवश्यकता छन् जुन पसलमा उपलब्ध छैन । ती पुस्तकहरू ल्याइदिन मन्जुरी गराउनुहोस् ।)
-
25. There is a strike. Ask a stranger to lift by bicycle to New Baneshwor. (चक्का जाम भएको हुनाले एक जना अपरिचीत व्यक्तिलाई साइकलद्वारा नयाँ वानेश्वरसम्म पुऱ्याइदिन आग्रह गर्नुहोस् ।)
-
26. You are at friend's house talking about your vacation plans. You are thirsty. (तपाईं आफ्नो साथीको घरमा विदाको योजनाको बारेमा कुराकानी गर्दै हुनुहुन्छ । तपाईंलाई तिर्खा लाग्यो ।)
-
27. You are at elderly aunt's house. She is trying to read the newspaper but the print is too small. What would you say to your aunt ? (तपाईं आफ्नो बुढी काकीको घरमा हुनुहुन्छ । उहाँ समाचार पढ्न कोशिस गरिराख्नुभएको छ तर उहाँको लागि अक्षर एकदमै सानो भयो । तपाईंले आफ्नो काकीलाई के भन्नुहुन्छ ?)
-
28. You are at a party and your room-mate who has recently quit smoking, is lighting up cigarette. (तपाईं एउटा भोजमा हुनुहुन्छ र भरखरै धूम्रपान छोडेको साथी चुरोट सल्काइरहेको छ ।)
-

Thank you for your co-operation.

Table No. 2	Request Forms in the Tharu Language	26
Table No. 3	Total Responses used by Tharu Speakers	27
Table No. 4	Total Responses Used by Friends	28
Table No. 5	Request Forms in the Friend-Friend Relationship	30
Table No. 6	Total Responses Used by Strangers	31
Table No. 7	List of Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Strangers	32
Table No. 8	Total Responses Used by Teachers and Students	33
Table No. 9	List of Total Request Forms in the Context of Student-Teacher Relationship	35
Table No. 10	Total Responses used by Relatives	35
Table No. 11	List of Total Request Forms in the Context of Relatives	37
Table No. 12	Total Responses used by Customers and Shopkeepers	38
Table No. 13	List of Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Customers and Shopkeepers	39
Table No. 14	Total Forms of Request Found Between Patients and Doctors	40
Table No. 15	Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Patients and Doctors	41
Table No. 16	Total Responses Used by Neighbours	41
Table No. 17	Total Request Forms in the Relationship of Neighbours	43
Table No. 18	Total Request Forms Used by Tharu Native Speakers in Item-Wise Relationship	44
Table No. 19	Total Request Forms of Educated and Uneducated Tharu Speakers	44
Table No. 20	Comparison of Direct Request	46
Table No. 21	Comparison of Indirect Request	47
Table No. 22	Total Request Forms Used by Tharu Language Speakers	48