CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is consisting of two important parts. The first part is the review of related theories which consists of all the theories to help the researcher in answering the research questions. The second part is about the review of two previous studies.

2.1 Speech acts

According to Sadock in Horn, speech act is when we speak we can do all sorts of things, from aspirating a consonant, to constructing a relative clause, to insulting a guest, and to starting a war. It also called acts done in the process of speaking. Speech acts have been claimed by (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, 1975). According Austin, speech acts are when we all spoken something we doing something (which to say something, in saying something, or even by saying something). Speech acts have been categorized into three, they are locutioary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts.

2.1.1 Locutionary acts

According to Austin (1962), locutionary acts are acts of speaking such as uttering certain sounds or making certain marks, using particular words and using them in conformity with the grammatical rules of a

7

particular language and with certain senses and certain references as determined by the rules of the language from which they are drawn.

2.1.2 Illocutionary acts

This case is Austin's central innovation, illocutionary acts are the intention of the speaker, acts done in speaking. Based on Austin that explains by Mey (1993:131), illocutionary acts divided into five parts (representatives, directives, commissives, declarations, and expressives). In the illocutionary acts of directives are the point of which is to direct the hearer towards doing something.

Based on the philosophers (Austin, 1962; Griece, 1957, 1975; Searle, 1969, 1975, 1979, and etc), from the assumption that the minimal units of human communication are not linguistic expressions, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving direction, apologizing, thanking, and so on. In the speech acts, there is a basic distinction offered is between direct speech act and indirect speech act. Direct speech acts, where the speaker says what he or she means. Indirect speech act where he or she means more than or something other than, what he or she says.

2.1.3 Perlocutionary acts

According Austin (1962), perlocutionary acts are the effect of utterances on the hearer, upon thoughts, feeling, or action of the addressee.

As the name is designed to suggest, whereby perlocutions are acts performed by speaking.

2.2 Request

A request is an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to the hearer (requestee) that he/she wants to the requestee performs an act, which is to get benefit from the requestee (Trosborg, 1994: 187). In such cases the speaker intends to produce a certain illocutionary effect in the hearer, and he intends to produce this effect by getting the hearer to recognize his intention to produce it, and he intends to get the hearer to recognize this intention in virtue of the hearer's knowledge of the rules that govern the utterance of the sentence (Searle, 1979: 30). In other words, request is an utterance or speech that express by the speaker's wish and the hearer should perform an action based on the request given by the speaker. In a request, the act to be performed is solely in the interest of the speaker and normally, at the cost of the hearer. Therefore, the features "benefit to speaker", "cost to hearer" are in principle (Trosborg, 1994: 188).

According to Wardaugh (1985: 163), one of the first principle the speaker must observe in making request is that, if the speaker want somebody to do something, he/she have to be careful about how he/she go about specifying to that person that it can be done. When the speaker makes request that is, the speaker can get others to do things or not to do them in a variety of ways so far as grammatical devices are concerned. Then, according to Searle

(1979: 30) request is the speaker intends to produce in the hearer the knowledge that a request has been made to him, and he intends to produce this knowledge by means of getting the hearer to recognize his intention to produce it. Thus, an act of requesting has among its felicity conditions: (1) the requirement that the speaker desires the addressee to perform the requested action and (2) that the speaker believes that the hearer is able to carry out the action (Horn and Ward, 2004: 69).

Furthermore, the act may be request for non-verbal and services, i.e. a request for an object, an action, or some kind of service, etc., or it can be request for verbal goods and services, i.e. a request for information (Trosborg, 1994: 1987). Gordon and Lakoff (1971, 1975) also note the generalization behind such inference rules, namely that to state or question a felicity condition on a speech act (with some restrictions), where the literal force of such a statement or question is blocked by context, counts as performing that specific speech act (cited in Levinson, 1983: 271).

Request can be carried out in several used, for example in dialogue routine, which is aimed to give reason, and conform. It is the reason that request occurs in the situation of inequality. Hence, there are some classifications of request strategies by Trosborg. Trosborg classified request strategies into four main categories, that is it Indirect Request, Conventionally Indirect or known as hearer-oriented conditions, Conventionally Indirect (speaker-based on conditions), and Direct Request. It is shown in the

following figure, figure 2.1. The following figure is adapted from Trosborg (1991: 76) and Trosborg (1994: 192-204). All the explanation of each strategy will be explained below figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1. Request Strategies

Category I   : Indirect Request
    Strategy I   : *Mild Hints*
    Strategy II   : *Strong Hints*
Category II   : Conventionally Indirect (Hearer-Oriented Conditions)
    Strategy III   : *Hearer's Ability*
    Strategy IV   : *Hearer's Willingness*
    Strategy V   : *Suggestory Formulae*
Category III   : Conventionally Indirect (Speaker-Based Condition)
    Strategy VI   : *Statements of speaker's wishes and desires*
    Strategy VII   : *Statements of speaker's needs and demands*
Category IV   : Direct Request
    Strategy VIII   : *Statements of obligation and necessity*
    Strategy IX   : *Performatives*
    Strategy X   : *Imperatives*

From figure above will be explained more below.

2.2.1. Indirect Request

This category explores that the speaker (requester) making a request in the indirect way to get what his or her intends and to get the hearer (requestee) to recognize this intention in virtue of the hearer's knowledge of the rules that govern the utterance of the sentence (Searle, 1979: 30). Thus, hinting strategies are the characteristic of Indirect Request, which

can be used when the speaker does not want to express his or her impositive intent explicitly (Trosborg, 1994: 192). However, the requester can leave out the desire and avoids mentioning the requestee as the intended agent. Hence, the desire and wish can be implied to the hearer, for instance, by making a statement that describes an undesired situation or by asking a question (Trosborg, 1994: 192).

When interpreting a hint, it is often necessary to possess intimate knowledge of the other person, to have specific background knowledge, and to be aware of specific situational features. For example, '*I'm to be at the airport in half an hour (and my car has just broken down).*' It can hardly be interpreted as a request to borrow the hearer's car without the information given in the brackets, unless the speaker possesses specific background information (Trosborg, 1994: 193).

Trosborg (1994: 194-196) states that hint presented as involving conditions of reasonable, availability, and obviousness. First is the reasonable condition. This condition indicates the speaker's reason for making his or her request is a useful way of indirectly conveying an impositive intent. It is typically as expressed as casual clauses supporting to the request. Kasper (1993: 123) states in Hints, the interpretation of the speaker's intentions is highly context embedded, and is not secured either by the sentence meaning of the utterance (i.e., by its context-independent, literal meaning), as in direct requests (e.g., "Leave me alone, please"); or by some grammatical or semantic device,

conventionally used to convey the requestive force, as in indirect, conventional requests (e.g., "Could you/ Would you leave me alone, please?")

For example, '*Would you do the dishes? The kitchen is a total mess.*' From the example, in the second sentence is the supporting the request which is mentioned in the first sentence. For putting the reason to make a request, the requester is anticipating potential questions from the hearer, while at the same time he or she provides a justification for asking. Thus, the requester making a reasonable request which is to find out whether the requestee finds his or her reasons for asking reasonable and acceptable (Trosborg, 1994: 194).

Second is availability condition, it is questioning some conditions that would present an obstacle to compliance (if not fulfilled) is another way of giving a hint. For example, '*Is there any coffee left?*' the structure could serve as hints as it explicitly states a condition of decisive importance for request like '*Could I have another cup of coffee?*' (Trosborg, 1994: 195).

The last is obviousness condition. This pre-condition for the speaker conveys his or her desire for the act in the question to be performed. For example, '*Has the letter already been typed?*' If the acts in questions have not already been carried out, the utterances indirectly may serve as an attempt on the part of the speaker to make the hearer to do so (Trosborg, 1994: 195-196).

In the Indirect Request, Trosborg (1994: 192-193) divided into two forms, that is it *Mild Hints* and *Strong Hints*. More explanation will be explained below.

1. Mild Hints

Mild hints are the category whereas the requester (the speaker) can leave out the desired action altogether (Trosborg, 1994: 192). Mild hints are utterances that make no reference to the request proper or any of its elements but are interpretable through the context as requests, indirectly pragmatically implying the act (Blum-Kulka, et. Al (1989) cited in Fitriana, 2012: 2048).

Some instance are '*The dishes need to be done.*', '*I am so thirsty.*', and '*The kitchen is total mess.*'. These examples explores that a speaker does not explicitly mention his or her desired to the hearer, and the hearer must figure out for him or herself about the speaker wishes (Trosborg, 1994: 192).

2. Strong Hints

This category is the wishes of the requester can be partially mentioned (Trosborg, 1994: 192). For instance, '*Has the car been cleaned (already)?*'. From this example, the desired act is clearly specified in proposition, but the speaker only omits explicit mention of the hearer as the agent (Trosborg, 1994: 193).

2.2.2. Conventionally Indirect (Hearer-Oriented Conditions)

This category is request 'hearer-oriented' to convey that the hearer is in position of control to decide whether or not to comply with the request. For this reason, 'hearer-oriented' requests are commonly more polite than request formulated 'speaker-based' conditions (Trosborg, 1994: 197).

In this category have three strategies which are appear as heavily routinized request forms, namely *Hearer's Ability, Hearer's Willingness,* and *Suggestory Formulae*.

1. Hearer's Ability

Aijmer (1996: 132) claims that ability is asking about the hearer's ability to do something, and usually using term '*Can you…*'. Trosborg (1994, 197) states that request is employ a hearer-based pre-condition, the desired act is specified in the proposition and the hearer as assigned to the role of agent.

For example, '*Could you open the window for me, please?*', and '*Could you bring me the foods, please?*' (Trosborg, 1994: 198) All the examples explores that the speaker questions about the hearer ability to perform the act, such as opening the window, and bringing him or her the foods.

2. **Hearer's Willingness**

According to Aijmer (1996: 132) willingness is asking whether the hearer is willing to do something or has any objection to doing something. This strategy always uses term '*Will you…*' or '*Would you (like)…*'. For instance '*Will you do the shopping today?*' and '*Would you lend me a copy of your book?*'. Hence, request querying the hearer's willingness may be embedded in expression of appreciation, hope, etcetera on behalf of the requester (Trosborg, 1994: 199). Willingness also used for another way to make a request of permission which is used term '*Can*' or '*May*'. For example, '*May/ Can I have a match?*' (Trosborg, 1994: 200).

3. **Suggestory Formulae**

Trosborg (1994: 201) argues that this strategy is used when the requester does not question any particular hearer-based condition, rather he or she test the hearer's cooperativeness in general by inquiring whether any conditions exist that might prevent the hearer from carrying out the action specified by the proposition. In the other word, suggestory formulae are the utterances that contain suggestion. Hence, suggestory formula is able to make his or her request more tentative and plays down his or her interest as a beneficiary of the action (Trosborg, 1994: 201). For the example, '*How about lending me some of your records?*' and '*Why don't you come with me?*' (Trosborg, 1994: 201). From the explanation, the point is both of the speaker and the hearer do the action and get the benefit.

2.2.3. Conventionally Indirect (Speaker-Based Conditions)

A requester can choose to focus on speaker-based conditions, rather than querying hearer-oriented conditions, thereby making his/her own desires the vocal point of the interaction (Trosborg, 1994: 201). By placing the speaker's interests above the hearer's, the request be-comes more direct in its demand. The speaker's statement of his/her intent may be expressed politely as a wish (Strategy 4) or more bluntly as a demand (Strategy 5). Therefore, this category has two strategies *Statements of Speaker's Wishes and Desires* and *Statements of Speaker's Needs and Demands*.

1. Statements of Speaker's Wishes and Desires

This strategy is only the speaker wishes and desires an act to be performed (Trosborg, 1994: 201). It is more polite than second type (speaker's needs and demands), because in this strategy uses modal verb '*I would like…*'. For the example, '*I would like to have some more coffee.*', '*I would like you to do the gardening today.*', '*I would rather you gave up tennis. *', and '*I would prefer her to visit me.*'.

2. Statements of Speaker's Needs and Demands

This strategy is impolite than first type, because in this type the speaker directly request to the hearer, and the hearer will perform it. For the example, '*I need a pen.*', '*I could do with a rest now.*', '*I want*

you to sign this for me.', '*I want the manuscript ready by noon.*'. It can be softened by put '*please*' in the request, or some other mitigating device, e.g. '*I so much want to see that film, please (let me go.)*' (Trosborg, 1994: 202).

2.2.4. Direct Request

This category is where the speaker makes his or her request in explicit way (Trosborg, 1994: 202). The requester (the speaker) chooses a modal verb expressing obligation or necessity in his or her request in explicit way. That is it, this category divide into three types *Statements of Obligation and Necessity*, *Performatives*, and *Imperatives*.

1. Statements of Obligation and Necessity

This strategy is the speaker applies either his or her own authority, or he or she refers to some authority outside the speaker (institution, brute facts, etc) (Trosborg, 1994: 202). The structure in this strategy usually used '*should*' and '*ought to*' that involve moral obligation. Moreover, '*have to*' may involve some obligation stemming from a source outside the speaker, while '*must*' often expresses obligation imposed by the speaker. '*Must*' may also be used empathically to express involvement, urgency, etc (Trosborg, 1994: 203).

Here is the example of *Statements of Obligation and Necessity*, '*You should/ ought to leave now.*', '*You have to leave now (or you'll*

miss your train).', and '*You must leave now (because I want you to).'*

(Trosborg, 1994: 203).

2. Performatives

The inclusion of a performative verb conveying requestive intent (ask, request, order, demand, command, etc) explicitly marks the utterances as order (Trosborg, 1994: 203). Therefore, performative statements are very direct and usually authoritative. For instance, the requestive intent is explicitly '*I ask/ request/ command/ order you to leave.'*. If the speaker wants to soften, he or she possible to use hedged performative as his or her request, for example '*I would like to ask you to leave. (hedged).'*, '*I must ask you to refrain from smoking. (hedged).'* (Trosborg, 1994, 203).

3. Imperatives

This strategy is the grammatical form directly signaling that the utterance is an order. It is very authoritative, and when there is an order issued by authority figure, it must be obeyed. If the speaker has power over the hearer, the later is obliged to carry out the order, for example, orders from parents to child, from teacher to pupil, from officer to soldier, from employer to employee, etcetera (Trosborg, 1994:204).

Some instances, '*Leave the place at once.'*, and '*Get out of here.'*. Imperatives also can be softened by adding tags and/ or the marker

'*please*'. Here the example, '*Open the door, please.*', and '*Leave it to me, will you.*'. Another way is elliptical phrases to interpret imperatives statement. The speaker only mentions the desired object in the elliptical phrases, for the example, '*Two coffee, please.*', and '*A scotch, please.*' (Trosborg, 1994: 204).

2.3 Previous Studies

As her related study, the writer uses a study from previous researcher in the same field as this study but different subject. The previous researches were conducted by Veronica N. Loanata (student of Petra University Surabaya) which enriches request strategies to the writer. In additional, there is also Iis Sabiah (student of Padjajaran University Bandung) who conducted a thesis that has the same aspect with this thesis. The last is a journal by Fitriana Rahmawati from Samarinda Indonesia who conducted the research in the society. Some explanation of three references is stated below.

2.3.1 The Request Strategies Used by Margaret Tate to Andrew Paxton Before and After The Contract Marriage in The Proposal Movie

The research of Veronica N. Loanata (2011) used data from movie *The Proposal*. The aimed of her thesis is to investigate and know what are types and frequencies used by the characters in the movie, and to know the similarities and differences the requests strategies used by Margaret as the

main character in before and after the contract marriage. She divides request strategy into ten strategies in four categories that supported theory by Anna Trosborg and Blum-Kulka. For the methodology, she used qualitative approach supported by quantitative data to find out the answers of her objective the study.

2.3.2 Internal Modification of Requests Strategies in the Movie of The Big Bang Theory: A Pragmatic Study

This is a journal of social sciences by Iis Sabiah (2012) that used movie *The Big Bang Theory* as her object. The objectives of the research are to describe requests strategies applied by the character and to describe the categories of internal modification used by the character in the movies. The result showed the following there are four main categories of requests strategies applied by the requester. She uses the descriptive method as it is one way to describe the phenomenon that takes place among the society

2.3.3 An Analysis to The Responsive of Dialogue Routine by Using Request Strategies

This is a journal of social science by Fitriana Rahmawati (2012). The objective of the research is to analyze the speech act of requesting strategies used by people in their society. The researcher is taken Blum Kulka's definition to analyze the request strategies. The methodology of

the study is questionnaire which is instruments taken are consisted on twelve questions. It is made up by the writer herself.

By the all explanation above, it can be seen the different from this study. First, this study explores about the similarities and the differences request strategies used by female and male character in the movie *The Blind Side* which is different with the previous researchers. Even though, two of the previous studies using movie as the object, but, this study has a unique one. Because of this movie is taken from a true extraordinary story which is different with previous object. Second, this study shows request strategies used by gender (female and male). In addition, this study is to know how female and male character when they give request to someone which is different with the previous study. The last, this study is not use frequencies as the problem which is different with the previous studies, because the researcher thinks that frequencies are not needed to do in this research. Hence, this study can be said that has a special thing for research.

.