

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter explores theoretical bases underlying this study. There are three sections in this chapter. The first section describes part summarizes theoretical framework of requests. Because speech act involves request, furthermore details explanation about it is also available in the first section. The second described review of related theories about perspectives on request strategies theory. The third part includes review of related studies about requests. Below are further explanations.

#### **2. 1. Theoretical Framework**

In this part, the writer will explain about request and the theory that is used to analyze the data. The theory that is used by the writer is request strategies theory that is proposed by Blum-Bulka, House, and Kasper (1989).

##### **2.1.1. Request**

The theory of request showed the reader that requests can be made up by using model verb such as can, may, will, etc. Actually, a request is not in itself aggressive like a threat, but can be potentially offensive or threatening it on the privacy of the individual who is requested to do something. Request occurs above all, in the text types which involve some interaction between speaker and hearer. In making request, the speaker may do it by asking a question, suggesting something, or making an order. Searle (1969) stated that questions are types of

directives, as by making question imply that the speaker wants to get the addressee to answer or to perform something. Request is classified as a directive speech act because of its characteristic and function. Directives embody an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something that is to direct the hearer towards pursuing a goal, generally a speaker's goal. According to Searle, a request is defined as

“a directive speech act which counts as an attempt to get H (the hearer) to do an act which S (the speaker) wants H to do, and which S believes that H is able to do; and which it is not obvious that H will do in the normal course of events or of H's own accord.” (Searle, 1969, p. 66)

This indicates that the speech act of request consists of three basic elements namely the speaker (S), the hearer (H), and the act (A) itself. In order to produce a successful requestive speech act, the speaker must believe that the hearer is able to do the act intended by the speaker, and the hearer must have willingness to do the act.

Searle (1969, p.71) proposes the condition for requesting as follow:

[Where S = speaker, H = hearer, A = the future action]

- a. Preparatory condition : H is able to perform A
- b. Sincerity condition : S wants H to do A
- c. Propositional condition : S predicates a future act A of H
- d. Essential condition : counts an attempt by S to get H to do A

### **2.1.2. Request Strategies**

Request strategies are various in strategy type and level of directness. The best taxonomy of request strategies' study is given by Blum-Bulka, House, and

Kasper (1989). Basically there are only two types of request, namely direct and indirect. Furthermore, the indirect type is classified into two different categories. Therefore, there are three types of request overall. The first type is 'direct'. It includes forms that convey requestive speech act purely by syntactic means such as grammatical mood or an explicit performative verb. The second is 'conventionally indirect' which comprises indirect formulas conventionalized in the language as a means of requesting. The third is 'non-conventionally indirect' which refers to hints. Indirect requestive forms are classified as not conventionalized in the language and hence require more inference by the hearer to derive the speaker's requestive intent. The request strategies in the following classification are ordered according to decreasing degree of directness. Blum Kulka, House and Kasper's theory (1989) summarized combination of level of directness and strategy types in CCSARP project as follow on the table:

<b>DIRECT LEVEL</b>	Mood Derivable
	Performatives
	Hedged performative
	Obligation statement
	Want statement
<b>CONVENTIONALLY INDIRECT LEVEL</b>	Suggestory formulae
	Query-preparatory
<b>NON-CONVENTIONALLY INDIRECT LEVEL</b>	Strong Hints
	Mild Hints

(Table of request and sub-request strategies)

### 2.1.2.1. Direct level

The first level is 'direct'. It marked explicitly as requests. The strategy requires the speaker to directly utter what he/she means. The formation of the utterances uses grammatical signals, such as imperative sentences. Moreover, the result shows that the hearer directly tries to fulfill the request. The examples of each sub request strategies are come from utterance of a student asking a classmate to borrow him his note. There are five sub-strategies of direct level. Below is the classification:

#### 2.1.2.1.1. Mood derivable

Mood derivable is an utterance made by a speaker based on grammatical mood the verb signaling illocutionary force in deciding the requestive statement. The form can be imperative and elliptical sentence structure. Because of the clause type is imperative so that the sentence force is required.

For example: "Give me your note."

"Borrow me your note"

#### 2.1.2.1.2. Performatives

Performatives is an utterance in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named by the speakers. It applies when the speakers explicitly name the request by mentioning the verb 'ask for/ request'.

For example: "I'll tell you to give me your note."

"I'm asking you to give your note."

#### 2.1.2.1.3. Hedged performatives

Hedge pervormatives is an utterance in which the illocutionary verb denoting the requestive intent is modified by modal verb or expressing intention.

The utterances embedding the naming of the illocutionary force. The illocutionary intent explicitly with the verb 'ask for/request', but in which the force of it is attenuated by the use of a modal verb.

For example: "I would like to ask you to give me your note."

"I would like the forms to apply to study in Australia."

#### 2.1.2.1.4. Obligation statements

Obligation statement is an utterance in which the illocutionary intent is directly derivable from the semantic meaning of the locution. It deals with an utterance which states the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act.

For example: "Sir, you'll have to give your note."

"I must let you give your note to me"

#### 2.1.2.1.5. Want statements

Want Statement is an utterance expresses the speaker's intentions, desire or feeling that the act denoted in proposition to be realized. They state a desire for the goal of the request to be realized with a relevant modal verb.

For example: "I want you to give your note."

"Please sir, I need your note"

#### 2.1.2.2. Conventionally indirect level

The second level is conventionally indirect. It refers to contextual preconditions necessary for its performance as conventionalized in the language. Bearing on Searle (1991), there are distinctions between literal sentence meaning and utterance meaning. A convention of language is the literal meaning of utterances and conventions of usage is the utterances meaning. The literal

meaning may be inadequate in the context. It could be said that the speaker is still being co-operatives when formulating the utterances. In order to interpret what they have heard, hearers follow a procedure from conventions of language to conventions of usage. Here is an example: "Can you pass your note?" The expression of "Pass your note" is automatically processed by understanding the literal meaning. Literal meaning is essential for the right interpretation of indirect speech act. The examples of each sub request strategies are come from utterances of a student asking a classmate to borrow him his note. There are two sub-strategies of conventionally indirect level, those are:

#### 2.1.2.2.1. Suggestory formulae:

A Suggestory formula is an utterance in which the illocutionary intent is express as a suggestion to do something or as a means of framing routine formula. Requests which are consisting question about the hearer's availability and conventionally of direct items.

For example: "How about giving your note?"

"Why don't you give your note?"

#### 2.1.2.2.2. Query-preparatory

Query-preparatory is an utterance containing reference to preparatory conditions (e.g. ability, willingness, and possibilities) in which a speaker uses a relevant modal verb to ask a question about hearer's ability or a question about speaker's permission as conventionalized in given language.

For example: "Would you mind giving your note?"

"Could I borrow your notes?"

### 2.1.2.3. Non-conventionally indirect level

The last level is non-conventionally indirect (i.e. hints). A hint is an indirect request form which is not conventionalized in the language, and hence requires more inference activity for the hearer to derive the speaker's requestive intent. Here is an example "I'm not really good to make notes?" The speaker can deny of requesting notes, but he/she cannot deny that he/she cannot make notes. The examples of each sub request strategies are come from utterances of (a student asking a classmate to borrow him his note). There are two sub-request strategies of non-conventional indirect level:

#### 2.1.2.3.1. Strong hints

Strong Hints is an utterance containing partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act. Most of these are checks on information that function as requests because they succeed in eliciting an offer from the interlocutor.

For example: "I wasn't at the lecture yesterday."

"That note is my life."

#### 2.1.2.3.2 Mild hints

Mild Hints is an utterance in which the locution contains no element which are of immediate relevance to the intended illocution or proposition, thus putting increased demand for context analysis and knowledge activation on the interlocutor.

For example: "I didn't take any notes and I don't want to get a bad mark."

"Those are your notes, aren't they?"

In summary, the requests strategies developed by Blum-Bulka et. al. consists of nine common strategies. These strategies actually already exist in the speech act of daily conversation. Therefore, there are many kinds of similar research conducted in many countries where English as well the other languages are spoken (Hassall, 1999; Gong, 1999; Jalilifar, 2009; Pohle, 2009; Codreanu & Debu, 2011). It means that this kind seems to be the most widely accepted by researchers and linguists of research with the same base of Blum-Bulka et. al's requests taxonomy can be conducted too in different country where the language spoken is not English.

### **2.1.3. Asking**

Requests for information (Asks) are analyzed separately from other requests in the study. This is because of problems presented by one strategy for asking for information, the 'direct. A direct question is the most direct way of all to ask for information, but as a means of asking for anything other than information (e.g. a good or a service). It is supporting theory from Hassall (1999). Edmondson (1981) defined a direct question which he calls a 'Question' as a query-locution used to perform a request for information with a minimum of indirectness (in Hassall 1999). A sufficiently clear intuitive notion of what is meant by a direct question can be gained through contrast with other interrogative request forms. Hassall divided asking as request into three, direct asking, conventionally indirect asking, and non-conventionally indirect asking. Bellow is descriptions and examples of each asking strategies coming from utterance of asking a stranger in the street the way to the post office



### 2.1.3.1. Direct Asking

Subjects strongly favor a direct strategy to ask for information. In particular, they make very frequent use of direct questions, which alone account for a large majority of Asks by subjects. The examples of each sub request strategies are come from utterances of (a student asking a classmate to borrow him his note).

For examples: “Do you know where the Post Office is?”

### 2.1.3.2. Conventionally Indirect Asking

Subjects only occasionally use a conventionally indirect request form to ask for information these forms are nearly all querying preparatory modal requests.

For example: “Can I ask where the post office is?”

### 2.1.3.3. Non-conventionally Indirect Asking

It also named hints asking. Hints are used occasionally by subjects to ask for information. All these hints consist of a statement that the speaker does not know the desired information.

For example: “Is the Post Office far from here?”

## 2.2. Review of Related Theories

In this part, the writer will explain about pragmatics as an umbrella of request strategy. And then types of speech which only illocutionary act implicative has classification. It is because pragmatic field only convey the illocutionary act. The last is Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFIDs) which is the essence of illocutionary act.

### 2.2.1. Pragmatics

Based on Yule (1997), Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning and contextual meaning of how more gets communicated than is said and also expression of relative distance. Pragmatics gives contribution of context to meaning and language use that are dependent on the speaker. Pragmatics is the most serious in the case of face-threatening speech act such as requests, refusals, apologies, complains, expressing gratitude, and so on (Brwon & Levinson, 1978). The type of study explores how a great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated.

### 2.2.2. Speech Act

People need to communicate with other people. The communication is the basis of people to perform actions. The relationship between people's statement and the actions performed via those statements reflect their speech act. In other word, speech acts are actions performed via utterances (Searle in Yule, 1997). The study of speech act does not only involve the study of people's utterances, but also communication strategies. This idea is in line with Searle's opinion that the communication strategies allow speaker to confirm their speech act. In delivering their messages, speakers use different forms of communication strategies (Yule, 1997). The types of act which is performed in a conversation are: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary act. The following are the explanations:

### 2.2.3. Types of Speech Act

#### 2.2.3.1. Locutionary Act

It is an act of how we produce the utterance or to produce a meaningful linguistics expression. When the speaker uses his/her organ of speech to produce utterance, then, indirectly there is the locutionary act in his/her utterance. In the other words, locutionary act is the act of the speaker in using his/her organ of speech to produce utterances. For example, “I promise to give you some money”,

#### 2.2.3.2. Illocutionary Act

It is about the function which is found in the utterances. In every utterance, there must be a function in it. This act seems to be the most important of all in terms of its functionality. The function which is found in the utterances is called the illocutionary act. For instance, “I promise to give you some money”, that utterance is not only a statement but it also binds the speaker to what s/he has just said. This is because that utterance intention is the fact that the speaker will do something in the future or we can say, the speaker promising something. Therefore, the illocutionary act of an utterance above is the act of promising.

#### 2.2.3.3. Perlocutionary Act

It is the effect of the utterance to the listener. The following example explains in detail: I promise to give you some money.

The effect of the utterance above can be a happy one. This is a result of the fact that the hearer really needs some money. Yet, it can also give the opposite effect to the hearer. The hearer may feel angry because of that utterance. This is

because the hearer is a very rich person who does not need any money from the speaker. The hearer will feel as if he is being mocked.

#### 2.2.4. Types of Illocutionary Act

The illocutionary act in speech act itself has its classification. Austin and Searle give its classification. The following are the classifications by Searle in Mey (1993, p. 163).

##### 2.2.4.1. Declaration

This illocutionary act is the kind of illocutionary act which can change the world by the utterance that is produced. The word “change” here refers to any situation. It can be the change of the status of a person. It can also be the ownership of something. The following is the example of declaration, “I declare you husband and wife.”

##### 2.2.4.2. Representative (Assertive)

Representative is the illocutionary act which states what the speaker to be the case or not and commits to the speaker truth. It shows the truth condition of the meaning of the utterance. The following is the example, “The sun rises in the East.”

##### 2.2.4.3. Expressive

Expressive is kind of illocutionary act which can show what the speaker feels. It expresses the psychological states. The example is shown by the following utterance, “I’m sorry to hear that”

##### 2.2.4.4. Directive

Directive is a kind of illocutionary act which is used by the speaker to get someone else to do something. This kind of illocutionary act can make the hearer

under an obligation. The example of directive illocutionary act, “Don’t be too noisy!”.

#### 2.2.4.5. Commisive

Commisive illocutionary act is an act which makes the speaker to commit what s/he said. It is also a future action of the speaker, “I promise to give you some money”

#### 2.2.5. Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFIDs)

People produce utterances for a purpose. They form an utterance with some kind of function in mind. This is the essence of illocutionary act. The illocutionary act is performed via the communicative force of an utterance. Thus, we may create a statement, an offer, an explanation, or for some other communicative purposes. In producing illocutionary act, IFIDs serve as the most obvious device to indicate the illocutionary force (Yule, 1999, p. 49). IFIDs work as performative verbs that explicitly name the illocutionary act being performed. Therefore, the verbs shown the IFIDs are called performative verbs (Vp). The basic pattern of IFIDs can be formed as follow:

I (Vp) you that.....

Based on the formula given above, here are the examples of them:

I (warn) you to stay away from me!

In this example, the speaker utters a warning to the hearer by producing a performative verb (warn). This performative verb represents his purpose to warn the hearer not to be close to the speaker.

It can be concluded from two examples above that IFIDs are the most powerful tools to identify illocutionary acts. Although the performance of IFIDS is not always in terms of performative verbs, there are many other ways to convey illocutionary acts without mentioning them. Some of the ways involve words order and stress.

### **2.3. Review of Related Studies**

In doing this study, the writer uses several studies that have been conducted by other researchers. The studies are used by the writer as references in conducting deeper analysis about the study. The first is a research called Requests Strategies in Indonesian (Hassall, 1999). The second research is about buyers and sellers' speech act as done by Rostina (2008) to traders in Aksara Market, Medan.

Hassall specified his study on investigating request strategies used by native Indonesian speakers who are studying in Australia. It was published in Journal of International Pragmatics Association (1999). The research was actually part of his dissertation. Hassall found that the variation in strategy choice by these Indonesians is generally consistent with Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) claim that speakers will select an increasingly indirect request strategy as the perceived threat to the hearer's face increases. It is important that these Indonesian subjects select the query preparatory modal sub-strategy as their main request type. Furthermore, he concluded that his study supports the contention that requests across many languages of diverse cultures are performed by highly similar strategies and sub-strategies.

Hassall's study was in contexts of English as a Second or Foreign Language. Therefore, the study is valid only to speakers of English. Based on this fact, there should be a research investigated in Indonesian. A research by Rostina (2009) was conducted in order to investigate speech acts of traders in Aksara Market, Medan. She investigated how buyers and sellers utter sentences when they are bargaining. This study has the most similar context with this study in terms of the subjects. It describes intensively buyers-sellers interaction by the time they are bargaining. Thus, it is very suitable for this study which also investigates request speech act performed by buyers and sellers in Pusat Grosir Surabaya. Besides, her research also shares another similarity that the subjects of the study speak Indonesian. Hence, the language context is also appropriate.

Rostina stated that directive speech act is the most performed speech act by traders. The proportion is 46,6 % of the data. The directive speech act includes requests. The kinds of act performed are only illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, because the most important aspects for these traders are the meaning of their utterances as well as the result of their utterances. They tend to state directly due to efficiency and effectiveness in doing trade.

The writer conducts a different research than the previous studies. In this study, the writer only focuses on the study of request strategy done to buyers and sellers at PGS. Furthermore, this study is specific only to Indonesian people especially traders at PGS that used Bahasa Indonesia. There is no comparison between Indonesian and foreigner like in Hassall's research. His research facilitated cross-cultural communication between native speakers of Indonesian and of English. And it contained of some Indonesia students who used Bahasa

Indonesia in Australia. Moreover, this study is different from Rostina's too. Rostina (2008) investigated all categorized of illocutionary acts, adjacency pairs, and systemic linguistic theory related to conversation structure. She uses the theory of Austin about speech act and Coulthard about adjacency pairs. So, the scope of her study is broad. Meanwhile, this study is specific only to investigate request as part of directive as a part of illocutionary act. The study uses theory of request by Blum, Bulka, House, and Kasper as cited in Hassall (1999).