CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Theoretical Framework

This subchapter presents the theory applied to analyze the intention of the mother in using particular speech act in daily conversation with their children during various activities. The main theory used in this study is the theory proposed by Bach & Harnish (1979) who stated that there are some acts in every utterance produce by a person. He proposed the categories of speech act based on the utterances characteristic. Furthermore, the writer also provides the explanation about speech act and its classification to strengthen the analysis of this study.

2.1.1   Pragmatics

In daily communication, people always have intention and purpose to be conveyed. In connection with the wide varieties of meaning that were explained by the speakers, it also needed various interpretations to interpret their purposes. The discussion about utterances through the message that delivered by the speakers and the interpretation that done by the interlocutors must be assessed through relevant discipline. There is no utterance is completely context free in terms of meaning or function (Hatch, 1992). Thus, pragmatics is one of the study in linguistic field of studies which efficient in order to examine the meaning of utterances in the context of communication.

8

Pragmatics is the study of language that based its analysis in context. The context here includes all background knowledge that jointly possessed by the speakers and the hearers also the things that accompany and provide such utterance (Rahardi 2005, in Yulianto, 2013). To identify that the intended condition is a pragmatic phenomena, first we have to comprehend some aspects that are used in the criteria of pragmatics. Wijana (1996, in Rahardi, 2009) put forward a number of aspects that must be comprehended in studying pragmatics, they are: speakers and hearers, the utterance context, the utterance aim, utterance as a form of activities, and utterance as a product of verbal acts. The descriptions of each are as below:

1. Speakers and hearers

There must be a speaker and a hearer in every dialogue or conversation happen in a communication. The aspects that related with speakers and hearers are age, socio-economic background, gender, degree of friendliness/closeness, and so on.

Leech (1983, in Yulianto, 2013) said that there are problems from both speakers and hearers. The problem for speaker is in establishing the planning, while for the hearer the problem is in interpreting. Speakers must have a logical reason in uttering an utterance to the hearers. From the side of the hearers, the procedure of interpretation is a problem that must be solved by the hearers in breaking what is uttered by speaker when he produce utterance.

2. The utterance context

The context is the knowledge which is jointly possesed, known and understood by the communicators so the hearers can understand the intent of the speakers (Kridalaksana, 2009, in Yulianto, 2013). This was in line with the opinion from Tarigan (1994, in Yulianto, 2013) which mentioned that the context in a utterance can be interpreted as background of knowledge that owned and approved by speakers and hearers, so it can support the interpretation of the hearers towards the speaker's intention.

3. The utterance aim

The forms of utterances that were conveyed by the speakers did have a particular aim. An utterance can had a variety of meaning and purpose. On the other hand, meaning and purpose of an utterance also can be conveyed by many different utterances. Leech (1983, in Yulianto, 2013) said that in pragmatics, speaking is an activity that is purpose-oriented. What we are expressed in the meaning of purpose aspect, have its specific purpose (Djajasudarma, 2009, in Yulianto, 2013).

4. Utterance as a form of activities

Pragmatics related to verbal acts that happened in certain situations. In relation to this, pragmatics is dealing with language in a more concrete level than the grammar. Utterances as an entity is

concrete because the existence of the speakers and hearers, and context of speech situation, also the time and place of speech are clear.

5. Utterance as a product of verbal acts

Utterances that is used in pragmatics, as mentioned in the fourth criteria above, is the application of speech act forms. For this reason, utterances which is produced is an utterance that contains a course of actions.

2.1.2 Speech Act

When we talk about the meaning of utterances in the context of communication, we deal with pragmatics. And when we deal with pragmatics, there are so many discussion that we can emerge from this field of studies, one of them is speech acts. Speech acts are the basic unit of a language (Searle, 1969) or also called as linguistic interaction (Griffiths, 2006). Speech acts also defines as speaker's utterances which convey meaning and make hearers do specific things (Austin, 1962). They are usually use in situations such as give a warning, greet people, confirm something, and some other act. Speech acts is a conventional acts that we perform with language. Most speech acts have propositional content. The main differences between diffrerent speech acts concerns to the way their content is involved.

Speech acts theory was first introduced by Austin (1962) and continued by Searle (1969). Bach & Harnish (1979) then redeveloped Searle's theory of speech

acts. Speech acts classified into three different acts, they are *locutionary act*; *illocutionary act*, and *perlocutionary act.* Locutionary act is an act that manifested through utterances which the aim is to assert or to inform something to the interlocutor without any certain intention other than its literal meaning. This is in line with the idea from Rahardi (2007) which stated that locutionary act is the act of uttering something through words, phrases, and the sentences themselves. The utterances that utter by the speaker is only used to inform something without any tendencies to do something, or especially to influence the interlocutor. This speech act is also commonly called as *The Act of Saying Something.*

Illocutionary act is an act which the utterance is used not only to tell or to inform something but also being used for certain function. Thus, illocutionary act is not only being comprehended through its utterance literal meaning, but also have to consider the context of the speech situation. This speech act is also commonly called as *The Act of Doing Something.* Perlocutionary act is an act which the utterance is uttered by the speaker and has the power to influence or give any effect to the hearer. This speech act is intended to influence, persuade, or affect the hearer so that he/she will trust or become willing to do something that has been said by the speaker to him/her. This perlocutionary act is also commonly called as *The Act of Affecting Someone.* According to Bach & Harnish (1979), the success of the speech acts is defined in terms of the recognition of the speaker's communicative intention by the hearer.

2.1.3 Illocutionary Act

The illocutionary act is one of sublevels of speech act. Illocutionary act is the central concept in speech act theory framework that has the function for analysing the use of language in a communication. Illocutionary act employs as a tool for understanding meaning of someone's utterances. Bach & Harnish (1979) propose the term of *mutual contextual beliefs* (MCBs) which defines as beliefs which relevant to and activated by the context of utterance, or by the utterance itself, that are shared and believed to be shared by the participants. The inference the hearer makes and takes himself to be inended to make is based not just on what the speaker says but also on MCBs. An illocutionary act is communicatively successful if the speaker's illocutionary intention is recognised by the hearer (Bach & Harnish, 1979). Each type of illocutionary act is individuated by the type of attitude expressed. Furthermore, Bach & Harnish (1979) pointed out four general categories of illocutionary act, they are constatives, directives, commisive and acknowledgment. Here are the explanation of each points:

a.   Constatives

Bach & Harnish (1979) borrow the terms 'constative' from Austin's terms of assertives. In general, a constative is the expression of a belief, together with the expression of an intention that the hearer form (or continue to hold) a like belief. The examples of constatives class are: affirming, announcing, answering,

claiming, classifying, confirming, denying, disagreeing, identifying, informing, predicting, and some other forms. The following are the various kinds of constatives:

- Assertives (simple): affirm, assert, claim, declare, deny (assert ... not), indicate, maintain, propound, say, state, submit.

- Predictives: forecast, predict, prophesy.

- Retrodictives: recount, report.

- Descriptives: assess, call, categorize, characterize, classify, describe, diagnose, evaluate, grade, identify, portray, rank.

- Ascriptives: ascribe, attribute, predicate.

- Informatives: advise, announce, inform, insist, notify, point out, report, reveal, tell, testify.

- Confirmatives: assess, bear witness, certify, conclude, confirm, diagnose, find, judge, substantiate, testify, validate, verify.

- Concessives: acknowledge, admit, agree, allow, assent, concede, concur, confess, grant, own.

- Retractives: correct, deny, disavow, disclaim, disown, recant, renounce, retract, take back, withdraw.

- Assentives: accept, agree, assent, concur.

- Dissentives: differ, disagree, dissent, reject.

- Disputatives: dispute, object, protest, question.

- Responsives: answer, reply, respond, retort.

- Suggestives: guess, hypothesize, speculate, suggest.

- Suppositives: assume, hypothesize, postulate, stipulate, suppose, theorize.

b. Directives

Bach & Harnish (1979) have the same terms of directives as Searle has. Directives deal with how we try to get people to do things. It has an intention to get the hearer to do something by the speaker utterances. Directives express the speaker's attitude toward some prospective action by the hearer. Bach proposed it encompassed a wide range of action verbs in English, such as advising, admonishing, asking, begging, dismissing, excusing, forbidding, instructing, ordering, permitting, requesting, requiring, suggesting, urging, warning and some other forms. Here are the the various kinds of directives:

- Requestives: ask, beg, beseech, implore, insist, invite, petition, plead, pray, request, solicit, summon, supplicate, tell, urge.

- Questions: ask, inquire, interrogate, query, question, quiz.

- Requirements: bid, charge, command, demand, dictate, direct, enjoin, instruct, order, prescribe, require.

- Prohibitives: enjoin, forbid, prohibit, proscribe, restrict.

- Advisories: admonish, advise, caution, counsel, propose, recommend, suggest, urge, warn.

c.   Commissives

Another function of speech acts is commissives. Commisives is about how we commit ourselves to do things. It is an action that the speaker undertakes or commits to do something by announcing an intention, like promising. According to Hatch (1992), commissives are statements that function as promises or refusals of action. Some examples of commissives are agreeing, betting, guaranteeing, inviting, offering, promising, swearing, volunteering and many other forms. Bellow are the the kinds of commissives:

- Promises: promise, swear, and vow.

- Offers: offer and propose.

d.   Acknowledgments

Expressives is about how we express our feelings and attitudes. In performing an expressive, the speaker is neither trying to get the world to match the words nor the words to match the world, rather the truth of the expressed proposition is presupposed. They express certain feelings toward the hearer. These feelings and their expression are appropriate to particular sorts of occasions. For exampie, greeting expresses pleasure at meeting or seeing someone, thanking

expresses gratitude for having received something, apologizing expresses regret for having harmed or bothered the hearer, and condoling expresses sympathy.

Because acknowledgments are expected on particular occasions, they are often issued not so much to express a genuine feeling as to satisfy the social expectation that such a feeling be expressed. Here are the kinds of acknowledgments:

- Apologize

- Condole: commiserate and condole.

- Congratulate: compliment, congratulate, felicitate.

- Greet

- Thank

- Bid: bid and wish

- Accept - acknowledge an acknowledgment

- Reject: refuse, reject, spurn.

2.1.4   Directive Speech Acts

Directives define as the kind of speech act that speakers use to get someone else to do something (Yule, 1997). According to Bach & Harnish (1979), they express what the speaker's attitude toward some prospective action by the hearer. Supporting this ides, Cutting (2002, in Amelia, 2008) says that this

category covers acts in which the words are aimed at making the hearer do something. However, they also express the speaker's intention (desire, wish) that his utterance or the attitude it expresses be taken as (a) reason for the hearer to act. Directive speech acts can be found in a form of commands, request, invitation, forbids, suggestions, orders, the like, and so other forms. They can be positive or negative, such as:

"Can you lend me a book, please?"

"Don't touch that."

All languages have directives, but the variation in directive forms within a language must be sensitive to social constrains. This variation in directive forms can also be examined by using the classification system of directives developed by Bach & Harnish (1979) as below:

- Requestives: (ask, beg, beseech, implore, insist, invite, petition, plead, pray, request, solicit, summon, supplicate, tell, urge)

  In uttering e, S requests H to A if S expresses:

  - the desire that H do A, and

  - the intention that H do A because (at least partly) of S's desire.

  Requestives express the speaker's desire that the hearer do something. Moreover, they express the speaker's intention that the hearer take this expressed desire as reason (or part of his reason) to act.

- Questions: (ask, inquire, interrogate, query, question, quiz)

  In uttering e, S questions H as to whether or not P if S expresses:

  - the desire that H tell S whether or not P, and

  - the intention that H tell S whether or not P because of S's desire.

  Questions are special cases of requests, special in that what is requested is that the hearer provide the speaker with certain information. There are differences between questions, but not all of them are important for an illocutionary taxonomy.

- Requirements: (bid, charge, command, demand, dictate, direct, enjoin, instruct, order, prescribe, require)

  In uttering e, S requires H to A if S expresses:

  - the belief that his utterance, in virtue of his authority over H, constitutes sufficient reason for H to A, and

  - the intention that H do A because of S's utterance.

  Requirements, such as ordering or dictating, should not be confused with requests, even strong ones. There is an important difference. In requesting, the speaker expresses his intention that the hearer take his (S's) expressed desire as a reason to act; in requirements S's expressed intention is that H take S's utterance as a reason to act, indeed as sufficient reason to act.

In expressing his belief and the corresponding intention, S is presuming that he has the authority over H (physical, psychological, or institutional) that gives such weight to his very utterances.

- Prohibitives: (enjoin, forbid, prohibit, proscribe, restrict)

    In uttering e, S prohibits H from A-ing if S expresses:

    - the belief that his utterance, in virtue of his authority over H, constitutes sufficient reason for H not to A, and

    - the intention that because of S's utterance H not do A.

    Prohibitives, such as forbidding or proscribing, are essentially requirements that the hearer not do a certain thing. Bach & Harnish (1979) list prohibitives separately because they take a distinct grammatical form and because there are a number of such verbs. We will let the entry for prohibitives speak for itself.

- Permissives: (agree to, allow, authorize, bless, consent to, dismiss, excuse, exempt, forgive, grant, license, pardon, release, sanction)

    In uttering e, S permits H to A if S expresses:

    - the belief that his utterance, in virtue of his authority over H, entitles H to A, and

    - the intention that H believe that S's utterance entitles him to A.

Permissives, like requirements and prohibitives, presume the speaker's authority. They express S's belief, and his intention that H believe, that S's utterance constitutes sufficient reason for H to feel free to do a certain action. The obvious reasons for issuing a permissive are either to grant a request for permission or to remove some antecedent restriction against the action in question.

- Advisories: (admonish, advise, caution, counsel, propose, recommend, suggest, urge, warn)

In uttering e, S advises H to A if S expresses:

- the belief that there is (sufficient) reason for H to A, and

- the intention thatH take S's belief as (sufficient) reason for him toA.

What the speaker expresses in advisories is not the desire that H do a certain action but the belief that doing it is a good idea, that it is in H's interest. S expresses also the intention that H take this belief of S's as a reason to act. Advisories vary in strength of expressed belief. Compare suggesting with admonishing. Furthermore, some advisories imply a special reason that the recommended action is a good idea. In warning, for example, S presumes the presence of some likely source of danger or trouble for H.

Based on Austin's discovery, it is known that every utterance performs an action and the action performed by the utterances may not be as it seems on the surface. An utterance may have more than one illocution, so it is needed to distinguish between direct speech act and indirect speech act since someone's utterance may operate on both levels. Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure (form) and a function, we have a direct speech act. While, whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have an indirect speech act (Yule, 1997).

What we have to know about direct and indirect speech acts are the relations between sentence literal meaning and speaker's intention meaning. Direct speech acts are deal with sentence literal meaning, what the speaker's directly mean or simply call it as 'the real meaning'. The speaker's utterances meaning in direct speech acts have the same intention with his/her literal sentence meaning. Differ from direct speech acts, in indirect speech acts, the speaker means what he/she says but he/she also means something else beyond their utterances. In indirect speech acts, people tend to be less straightforward and there is an intended meaning in it. According to Spenader (2004), indirect speech acts have intended meanings that are different from their literal meanings, the hearers recognize their real meaning based on the context where multiple factors affect the speaker's utterances.

2.2   Review of Related Studies

In conducting the present study, the writer uses some previous studies as the references. The first study is about mother's language conducted by Bernicot et al. in 1993. They examined about speech acts used by mother while having conversation with her child to determine the psychological, social, and cultural features of the communication situation. Variations in the nature of the speech acts produced were studied in relation to three variables describing the communication situation: a psychological variable; a social variable; and a cultural variable. The study found out that the production of speech acts is mainly controlled by the social characteristics of the communication situation rather than by its psychological and cultural features. Mothers appear instead to be sensitive to all three kinds of factors. The four types of speech acts proposed by Searle (assertive, directive, expressive, commissive) found in the study differ in their frequency of occurrence, linguistic form, and reaction to the psychological, social, and cultural characteristics of the communication situation. Finally, this study suggests that the effects of these characteristics on speech acts production are not uniform, but vary according to the factors under consideration.

The second study is from Meng (2008) which investigate different types of requests made by either mother or child in their daily interactions within family environment. Her study also aims at addressing how different grammatical structures are used in contextualized situations as well as how a certain pragmatic intent is expressed within a specific context. The results show that mothers tend to make both direct and indirect requests, using a wide range of linguistic forms and

communicative strategies in different contexts with their children. However, children use more direct requests than indirect ones when they communicate with their mothers, but they do use indirect requests with out-group members such as peers and other adults.

The third study is from Firdaus (2012) which examine the directive speech act of housewives from fisherman family towards their children. In her study, she describes the types of directive speech act and the child's responses that resulted from their daily conversation. Mother mostly used requesting directive speech act to her children based on their daily habitual in always asking their child to do something. The result also showed that the children response in verbal and non-verbal way. The response from the child depends on the mother's act of requesting. She concluded that the more polite the mothers use directive act, the more positive the responses from the children.