

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This framework consists of some needed theories. The writer analyzes Perseus' directive acts and leadership style. Since this research integrates two theories in order to make unusually analysis. Those theories are Speech Act, Classification of Illocutionary Act, Directive acts, Form of Directive Acts, and Leadership Style.

2.1 Speech Act

In the past three decades, **speech act theory** has become an important branch of the contemporary theory of language mainly to the influence of J.R Searle (1969) and H.P Grice (1957) whose ideas on meaning and communication have stimulated research in philosophy and in human and cognitive sciences. Speech acts is the action or intent that a speaker accomplishes when using language in the context, the meaning of which is inferred by hearer (Fromkin, 2003:78). There are some terms to represent the action of speech acts such as stating, requesting, informing, or promising.

2.1.1 Locutionary Act

Locutionary act is the aspect of language which has been the traditional concern of linguistics (Stubbs 1983:152). The locutionary act is the act of saying something: producing a series of sounds which means something. On other word,

For example, that a bartender utters the words, “The bar will be closed in ten minutes”, reported by means of direct quotation. He is thereby performing the locutionary act of saying that the bar (i.e., the one he is tending) will be closed in ten minutes (from the utterance), and what is said is reported by indirect quotation (notice that what the bartender is saying, the content of his locutionary act, is not fully determined by the words he is using, for they do not specify the bar in question or the time of the utterance). When the bartender does not utter it to a definite hearer, the utterance has no sense. However, the utterance is absolutely right because everyone can get the meaning easily.

Illocutionary act is performed in saying something, and includes acts such as betting, promising, denying, stating, promising, apologizing, threatening, predicting, ordering and requesting, and ordering (Liu, 2011). Some of the verbs used to label illocutionary acts can themselves be used performatively. Coulthard (1977:18) states that basically an illocutionary act is a linguistic act performed in uttering a certain words in a given context.

sby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

2.1.2 Perlocutionary Act

For instance a bartender utters the words, ‘The bar will be closed in five minutes’. Perlocutionary acts are performed with the intention of producing a further effect. The bartender intends to be performing the perlocutionary acts of causing the patrons to believe that the bar is about to close and of getting them to want and to order one last drink. He is performing all these speech acts, at all three levels, just by uttering certain words.

From Searle (1976:105) view, there are only five illocutionary points that speakers can achieve on propositions in an utterance, namely: the *assertive*, *directive*, *commissive*, *expressive* and *declaration illocutionary points*.

Example: “Jones is a disreputable businessman.”

2.2.2 Directives are statements that attempt to make the other person's actions fit the proposition contented. They are tries to get the listener to do something (requesting, ordering, and command, asking) (Liu, 2011:1803).

The speaker in this case “sister” gives command to the hearer which is symbolized by “her brother” to close the door.

Example:

- “I promise I’ll be there tomorrow.”

This could be a threat or a promise, depending on whether his presence tomorrow is a disadvantage or an advantage to the listener. Contrast the sentence above with:

- “If you don’t behave, I promise you there’s going to be trouble.”

This sentence says it's a "promise," but it's a "threat."

2.2.4 Expressives are statements that express the “sincerity condition of the speech act”. They express the attitude of speaker to a certain state of affairs detailed in the proposition contented (thanking, apologizing, congratulating).

Example:

- “I really sorry.”
- “I am very grateful.”
- “Congratulation for your wedding celebration.”

2.2.5 Declarations are statements that bring about correspondence between the proposition contented and the world (declaring, naming) (Liu, 2011: 1803).

Example: “Now, I pronounce both of you as husband and wife.”

The sentence declared by a priest on a wedding's bestowal of blessing.

2.3 Directive Acts

Directives are statements that try to make the other person's actions fit the proposition contented. They are tries to get the hearer to do something such as requesting, ordering, and command (Liu, 2011: 1803). According to Rohmah

(2011) in the directive's types, the speaker wants to reach a future situation in which the world will match with his words. Based on its function, directive acts is differentiated into some types as follows:

a. Command

Command is sentences which generally have no obvious grammatical focus, and whose verb is in the imperative mood (Quirk, 1972: 386). The function of command is used to instruct somebody to do something. It tends to be demanding, means that the command must be fulfilled.

Example: Chiro! Stop running!

The speaker command Chiro (his dog) to stop running.

b. Request

Request is not like command, it is generally less demanding. Searle (1976: 59) states that sometimes a speaker may utter the sentence *I want you to do it* by way of requesting the hearer to do something. The utterances are parenthetically intended as a statement, but actually it is also meant primarily as a request made by way of making statement.

c. Prohibition

Prohibition here means to prevent the hearer from doing something.

Prohibitive performatives include: enjoin, forbid, prohibit, proscribe, restrict

Example: You don't have to come with me.

The speaker prohibited hearer to follow him climbing the Ferris wheel to get a good vantage point to find the flag of another team.

d. Question/Asking

According to Quirk (1972: 386), question is primarily used to express lack of info on a detailed point, and commonly to request the hearer to supply this information verbally. Question can be divided into three classes based on the type of answer they expect.

1. Yes or no question such as “Have you been to Paris?”
2. Wh-questions such as “What is your name?”
3. The alternative questions such as “Would you like steak or chicken?”

2.4 Form of directive acts

Holmes in Richards and Schmidt (1984: 98) divides the directive acts into three major classifications based on their form:

a. Imperatives

Holmes in Richards and Schmidt (1984: 98) states that the imperative sentence tends to occur as realizations of directive in address to subordinate. Usually uses by speaker who has higher authority than the hearer. There are six structural variants of imperative sentence:

- a) Base form the Verb**

e.g.: ‘Speak Up’, ‘don’t shout out’, ‘has a look at the picture’

- ### b) You+Imperative

e.g.: 'You look here', 'you go on with your work', 'you just see the view'

c) Present Participle form of Verb

e.g.: ‘Just listening’, ‘looking at me’, ‘looking this way’

d) Verb+Ellipsis

e.g.: ‘Hands up’, ‘now this one’, ‘everybody on the mat’

e) Imperative+Modifier

e.g.: 'Children looking this flower please', 'put your finger on your ear everyone'

f) Let+First person pronoun

e.g: 'Let's finish there', 'let's see who can sit down rapidly'

b. Interrogatives

Holmes in Richards and Schmidt (1984: 98) divided interrogatives into two forms. First is a modal and second is non-modal interrogative directive.

a) Modals

e.g. 'Would you open the door?', 'Can you read that announcement for me?'

b) Non-modal interrogative directive

e.g: ‘Have you tried it?’, ‘Who can I see sitting quietly?’

c. Declaratives

Holmes in Richards and Schmidt (1984: 98) divided declarative into two contrasting categories according to their relative explicitness and the amount of inference required interpreting the directive intent, they are:

a) Embedded Agent

e.g. 'I'd like everyone sitting on the mat', 'I want you to draw a picture'

b) Hints

Hints require addresses to infer what is required from their knowledge of the rules for appropriate behavior in the context, for example: ‘That’s all’.

2.5 Leadership Style

Leadership style is the manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people (Ojokuku et al, 2012: 202). In 1939, a group of researchers led by psychologist Kurt Lewin set out to identify different styles of leadership. While further research has identified more specific types of leadership, this early study was very influential and established three major leadership styles. Lewin (1979: 379) divides as The Autocratic style, The Democratic and The Laissez-Fair leader style.

a. The Autocratic Style

Authoritarian leaders, also known as autocratic leaders, provide clear expectations for what needs to be done, when it should be done, and how it should be done (Cherry, 2012:39). There is also a clear division between the leader and the followers. Authoritarian leaders make decisions independently with little or no input from the rest of the group. The writer thoughts that decision-making was less creative under authoritarian leadership. Because this style usually viewed as controlling, bossy, and dictatorial.

Authoritarian leadership is best applied to situations where there is little time for group decision-making or where the leader is the most knowledgeable member of the group, useful when there is no essential for input on the decision and when decisions need to be made quickly without consulting with a large

group of people. Some projects require strong leadership in order to get things accomplished quickly and efficiently. Those explanation also supported by Herbert (1976:379) who states that the leader controls the future (giving one step at a time instruction), information (giving only orders, not sharing his knowledge), work (making all task and team assignment), member satisfactions (allowing no initiative or judgement to be used and using personal terms in criticism and praise), and relationship (each member is dependent on the leader anything new comes up).

b. The Democratic Style

Lewin (1979: 382) found that democratic leadership, also known as participative leadership, is generally the most effective leadership style. Democratic leaders offer guidance to group members, but they also participate in the group and allow input from other group members (Ojokuku et al, 2012:204). Participative leaders encourage group members to participate, but retain the final say over the decision-making process. Group members feel engaged in the process and are more motivated and creative.

c. The Laissez-Faire

The laissez-faire style also known as delegative leadership is a type of leadership style in which leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make their own the decisions (the leader minimizes his/her involvement in decision making) (Lewin, 1979: 385). This style works best when people are capable and motivated

2.6 Previous Study

The second previous study was conducted by Puni et al (2014) entitled “The Effect of Leadership Style on Firm Performance in Ghana” This research examines the effect of leadership on financial performance of two Ghanaian banks. Multiple Regression test was used to test the hypothesis in the study. The result showed that, none of the leadership styles significantly predicted financial performance of the two banks. but the democratic leadership style was found to account for more variance in financial performance than autocratic and laissez faire style. The result of their research shows there is no lot of difference. Based on those previous studies explained above, the writer decides to be different with them by conduct the research which connects leadership style and directive acts. Those theory are

