

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Review of Related Theories

2.1.1. Kasper and Rose's Second Language Pragmatic Development (2003)

The importance accorded to pragmatic ability surely must be met with a commensurate curiosity regarding the ways such ability develops, whether in order to better understand the different uses to which such ability is put, or to cultivate L2 (second language) pragmatic development as a domain within second language acquisition research, or establish research basis for instruction in L2 (second language) pragmatics (Kasper and Rose, 2003:1-2). In the further, the second language pragmatic development is based on some theories. These include theories with an intra-personal orientation (i.e., the acculturation model, cognitive processing) and those adopting an inter-personal perspective, conceptualizing L2 pragmatic learning as social practice (i.e., sociocultural competence) (Kasper and Rose, 2003:13). In which if elaborated; those theories involve the acculturation model, cognitive processing, sociocultural theory, language socialization, and interactional competence as goal and process.

2.1.2. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies (1987)

Politeness strategies are the way of saving the learners 'face'. Face refers to the respect that an individual has for himself or herself, and maintaining that 'self esteem' in public or in private situations. (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p.61). Brown and Levinson outline four main types of politeness strategies: bald on record, negative, positive, and off-record or indirect.

The first type is bald on record politeness strategies which provide no effort to minimize threats to the interlocutor's face. Sometimes it is used by the speaker who closely related with the interlocutor. Therefore, the interlocutor understands directly the speaker's instruction. Example: "Oh, I want to use of those!"

The second type is positive politeness strategies which minimize threat to the interlocutor's face. In this situation the speaker considers that the interlocutor has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity. Sometimes the speaker uses hedge to smooth utterance. Example: "So, is it okay if I use one of those pens?".

The third type is negative politeness strategies which provide imposing to the interlocutor. The speaker considers that the interlocutor want to be respected. Though, the speaker also assumes that the speaker imposes in some way. Example: "I am sorry to bother you but, I just want to ask you if I can use one of those pens?".

The last type is off- record or indirect politeness strategies which provide indirect language. The purpose is to pressure off of the interlocutor but the speaker does not directly try to impose the interlocutor. Instead, the speaker said to the interlocutor as if he/ she transformed to another utterance but still refer to one topic. Example: “Hmm, I sure could use a blue pen right now?”.

2.1.3. Austin’s Speech Acts Theory (1962)

Speech act theory originates in Austin’s (1962) observation that while sentences can often be used to report states of affairs, the utterance of some sentences, such as (i) and (ii) must, in specified circumstances, be treated as the performance of an act (Brown and Yule, 1993, p.231):

- (i) I bet you sixpence it will rain tomorrow
- (ii) I name this ship the Quen Elizabeth

It was initially proposed by John L. Austin in his book entitled “How to Do Things with Words” in 1962 (Cook, 1989, p.35). Austin defines speech acts as the actions performed in saying utterance (in Cutting, 2002, p.16). Austin’s ideas were further developed by other thinker such as the American John Searle, who had studied under Austin at Oxford in the fifties, and who became the main proponent and defender of the former’s ideas in the United States, and subsequently world wide (Mey, 1996, p.110).

2.1.4. Searle's Speech Act Categories (1977)

In his 1977 article 'A Classification of Illocutionary Acts', Searle states the following: the primary purpose of this paper is to develop a reasoned classification of illocutionary acts into certain basic categories of types (Searle, 1977, p.27). Searle's speech act categories include five categories which are: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives.

a. Representative Speech Acts

Ibrahim (1993, p.16) states that representatives are assertives, predictives, retrodictives, descriptives, ascriptives, informatives, confirmatives, concessives, retractives, assentives, dissentives, disputatives, responsives, sugestives. Those kinds of speech acts state that what the speaker believes to be the case or not are called representatives (Yule, 1997, p.53). The point of which is to represent a state affairs; which have a world-to-world fit, i.e. the intention is to make the words fit the world; in which a belief is expressed; and in which any proposition can occur, e.g. statement (in Mey, 1996, p.131). Robinson (2006, p.53) supports this idea that representatives are speech acts of stating what the speaker believes to be true. This kind of speech act includes statements of fact, assertions, conclusions, descriptions, etc. (Yule, 1997, p.53)

Examples:

- I can conclude that this problem is difficult to be solved
- Maybe, someone can help you
- I suggest you to find another book

In addition, Yule (1997, p.53) explains that in using a representative, the speaker makes the word (of belief). They are statements such as facts, assumptions, opinions, descriptions, conclusions, quotations, and paraphrases, etc.

b. Directive Speech Acts

Ibrahim (1993, p.16) states that directives are requisitives, questions, requirement, prohibitives, permissives, and advisories. Yule (1997, p.54) defines directives as the kind of speech act that speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. The point is to direct the hearer towards doing something; which have a world to world direction of fit; in which a wish is expressed; in which the proposition is a future act done by the hearer , e.g. orders (in Mey, 1996, p.131). Cutting also says that these category covers acts in which the words are aimed at making the hearer do something (2002, p.17). They are commands, requests, invitations, forbids, advice, orders and the like.

Examples:

- Could you pass the salt
- Drop your weapon or I'll shoot you!
- Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention please?

Ervin- Tripp (in Hatch, 1992, p.122) classifies into five types that include the relationship between the speaker and interlocutor roles:

1. Personal need/ desire statements

Example: I need/ want X

Interlocutor: Subordinates

2. Imperative

Example: Gimme X

Interlocutor: Subordinates or familiar equals

3. Imbedded imperative

Example: Could you give me X (please, ok)?

Interlocutor: Unfamiliar people; people who differ in rank or who are physically distant; someone who is in his or her own territory; someone whose willingness to comply is in doubt.

4. Permission directive

Example: May I have X? Is there any X left? Do you have X?

Interlocutor: Someone who might not comply; also used when there is an obstacle to compliance.

5. Hint (sometimes with humor)

Example: This has to be done over. What about the X?

Interlocutor: A persons with shared rules such as members of a family, people living together, and work groups.

c. Commissive Speech Acts

Commissives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action (Yule, 1997, p.54). The point of which is that the speaker commits himself to doing something; which have a world to world direction of fit; in which an intention is expressed; in which the proposition is a future act done by the speaker, e.g. promises (in Mey, 1996, p.131). According to Hatch (1992, p.125) commissives are statements that function as promises or refusals of action. They are promises, threats, refusals, pledges, offers, vows,

voluntaries and they can be performed by the speaker alone, or by the speaker as a member of a group. (Yule, 1997, p.54).

Examples: - I promise, I'll give it back
 - Maybe I can do that tomorrow
 - I'll be back

d. Expressives

Expressives are acts in which the words state what the speaker feels (Cutting, 2002, p.17). The point of which is that a certain psychological state is expressed; which have no direction of fit in which a wide range of psychological states can be expressed; in which the proposition ascribes property or act to the speaker or the hearer, e.g. congratulation (in Mey, 1996, p.131). Yule also says that they express psychological states and they can be caused by something the speaker wants the hearer does, but they are about the speaker's experience (1997, p.53). They can occur in forms of statement of pleasure, pain compliment (likes or dislikes), joy and sorrow. They also include expressions of apologizing, praising, congratulating, deploring, regretting and soon while Ibrahim (1993, p.16) elaborates expressives into greeting, thanking, apologizing, condoling, congratulating, bidding, accepting, rejecting, farewell, pardoning, excusing, appealing.

Examples: - Hi John
 - Sorry for that
 - Thank you very much for your attendance

e. Declarative Speech Acts

Declaratives are speech acts that, when uttered; bring about a new state of being (Hatch, 1992, p.128). The point of which to bring something about in the world; which have both a world-to-world and a world-to-world direction of fit; in which no psychological state is expressed; in which any proposition can occur, e.g an excommunication (in Mey, 1996, p.131). The statement is usually noted with the phrases such as ‘I bet’, ‘I declare’, ‘I resign’.

Examples: - I declare you to be husband and wife
 - I just resigned
 - I bet for the red car

2.1.5. Geertz’s Javanese Linguistic Etiquette (1976)

Gertz (1976, p.253) states that there are three main levels of language to determine the status, age grading and familiarity of the speakers in Javanese language: they are *Ngoko* (low), *Madya* (middle), and *Krama* (high).

Ngoko (non- formal) is the basic language, people think in this, fall into it whenever the urge to express themselves overcomes the desire to maintain propriety, and generally regard it, like the peasant himself, as the rough, down-to-earth, and necessary foundation on top of which all the *prijaji* (higher status) fancy work is erected (Gertz, 1976, p.254). This level of language is informal speech, used between friends and close relatives. It is also used by people of higher status to people of lower status, such as elders to younger people or employer to employee.

Example: (i) *Aku njaluk mangan.* (I ask for eating)

Madya (semi formal) is intermediary form between *Ngoko* and *Krama*. (Gertz, 1976, p.249). This level of language is used when people want to be neither too formal nor too informal towards the older people.

Example: (ii) *Kula nedhi nedha.* (I ask for eating)

Krama (formal) is the manner of speaking shifts too: the higher the level one is using, the more slowly and softly one speaks-and the more evenly, in terms both of rhythm and pitch (Gertz, 1976, p.254). This level of language is polite and formal style of Javanese linguistic etiquette which is used among people of the same status who they do not wish to be informal such as one of official style for public speeches, announcement, etc. It is also used by people of lower status to people of higher status, such as youngsters to elder people or employee to employer, younger people to oldest people.

Example:

- Neutral: (iii) *Kula nyuwun nedha.* (*I ask for eating*).

- Humble: (iv) *Dalem nyuwun nedha.* (*I ask for eating*).

- Mixed:

a. Honorific- addressed to someone with a high(er) status

(v) *punapa Ibu nyuwun dhahar?* (*Does mother ask for eating?*)

b. Reply towards persons with lower status

(vi). *Iya, aku nyuwun dhahar.* (*Yes, I ask for eating*)

c. Reply towards persons with lower status but without having need to express one's superiority.

(vii) *Iya. Aku njaluk mangan.* (*Yes I ask for eating*)

d. Reply towards persons with the same status.

(viii) *Inggih. Kula nyuwun dhahar. (Yes I ask for eating)*

The Javanese linguistic etiquette is very complex because the speaker will have to examine situational context of speech. According to the regents of the University of Minnesota (2009), the speech acts are difficult to perform in a foreign language (English) because learners (non native) may not know the idiomatic expressions or cultural norms in foreign language (English) or they may transfer their first language (Javanese) rules and conventions into the foreign language (English), assuming that such rules are universal. Because the natural tendency for language learners (non native) is to fall back on what they know to be appropriate in their first language (Javanese), it is important that these learners (non native) understand exactly what they do in that first language in order to be able to recognize what is transferable to other language (English). Something that works in Javanese might not transfer in meaning when translated into the foreign language (English). Thus, it is not considered if the second semester of Javanese students in English Department, Airlangga University (academic year 2008) apply directly the Javanese linguistic etiquette into English. For examples, (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) are as same as '*I ask for eating*'. But, though the Javanese linguistic etiquette is inapplicable directly into English, there is tendency that they may transfer their Javanese rules and conventions into English, assuming that such rules are universal. As Nadar (2009, p.135) states that when Javanese people speak, sometimes they speak with longer stretch of speech, more varieties, more consideration, indirectness, and avoiding face threatening acts to the interlocutor. Thus, however there is no language level in English but the Javanese linguistic

etiquette is considered has impact towards the Javanese students when they are speaking English. For example:

In the context of informal speech: the speaker to younger or coeval interlocutor.

Example: (ix) *I ask for eating.*

In the context of honorific- addressed to someone with a high(er) status.

Example: (x) *Excuse me, mom, pardon me, may I ask for eating, mom, please?*

Based on the situational context above, Javanese people tend to use short and simple directive speech acts in the context of informal speech (ix) while in the context of honorific addressed to someone with a high(er) status (x), Javanese people tend to use longer stretch of speech, more varieties, more consideration, indirectness, and avoiding face threatening acts to the interlocutor.

The phenomenon is considered as interlanguage pragmatics. Interlanguage pragmatics has consequently been defined as the study of nonnative speaker's use acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993:3). The Javanese speaker uses different interlanguage style when they are speaking in English. Hence, it appears usefull to include under ILP the study of intercultural styles brought about through language contact, the conditions for their emergence and change, the relationship to their substrata, and their communicative effectiveness (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993:3).

2.2. Review of Related Studies

Agustiningtyas (1992) in her thesis entitled '*Penggunaan Bahasa Jawa di Kalangan Remaja Surabaya dari Golongan Etnis Jawa (Sebuah Studi Analisis di SMP 4 dan SMA 4 Surabaya)*' studied the usage of Javanese language by Surabayan youth which is viewed from Javanese ethnic group. In the study, the writer tried to find out characteristics of Surabayan youth's speech acts towards Javanese linguistic etiquette: *Ngoko* (low), *Madya* (middle), *Krama* (high). The data of this study was taken from questionnaire, which was distributed to some of junior high school and senior high school students. Participants of this study were *SMP 4* (junior high school of 4) and *SMA 4* (senior high school of 4) students. The writer analyzed background of the Surabayan speaker then she concluded that the background influences the usage of Javanese linguistic etiquette: *Ngoko*, *Madya*, *Krama*.

After analyzing the data, the writer found some phenomena. First, the older the participant, the more the participant who uses *Ngoko* to parents and parents' consanguinity; second, the older the participant, the fewer the participant who uses mixing language (Indonesian- Javanese language) to schoolmates; third, the older the participant, the more the participant who uses *Ngoko* to schoolmates; fourth, the older the participant, the more the participant who uses Indonesian language to people who newly known; fifth, female participant tends to use mixing language (Indonesian- Javanese language) to parents' consanguinity; sixth, male participant tends to use Indonesian language to parents' consanguinity; seventh, male participant tends to use *Krama* to older foreigner; eight, Female

participant tends to use Indonesian language to older foreigner; ninth, male and female participants tend to use Indonesian language to people who newly known.

The previous study only concerns with cultural background of the Javanese speakers as participants and not elaborated yet into the role of Javanese linguistic etiquette towards Javanese students when they are speaking English. Moreover, this study is required to determine quality of linguistic etiquette towards them.

However, the participants of this study are Javanese students but this study also presents interference of Javanese language towards the perceived use of English directive speech act. It is analyzed by politeness strategies and elaborated by differ types of speech acts in each situational context. For the future, this study is useful for the further research, especially in the field of speech acts.