CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, the researcher reviews some theories, which are going to be used in the study. The researcher includes the important theories which are relevant for her study. In this part, the researcher explains the review of related theories. She reviews the theories which fully support her study about refusal expressions. The researcher discusses in brief about speech act, refusal expressions, and the concept of context of situation. These theories can help the researcher to solve her problem.

2.1.1 Speech Acts

a. Definition of Speech Act

People do not only produce utterances which contain grammatical structure and words when they speak. But also perform an action through those utterances. Utterances that perform an action are generally called as speech act (Yule, 1996: 47). Similarly Aitchison (2003: 106) defines speech act as a number of utterance behave somewhat like actions. Based on that opinion above, it can be concluded that speech act is the act performed by a speaker in uttering a sentence. The functions of the speech act itself is to state the speaker's intention to the hearer.

The discussion of speech act cannot be separated from the other aspects of speaking activities, such as speech situation and speech event. Speech situation

is a speech which is associated with the situation and an event may consist of one or more speech acts (Hymes in Fasold. 1999: 42). Austin (in Levinson, 1983: 236) divides three basic senses in which when someone says something, he or she is also doing something at the same time, they are:

- Locutionary act is the real word that is uttered by a speaker and it contains the speaker's verbalized message.
- 2) Illocutionary act is the power or intention behind the words that is uttered by the speaker. It indicates the speaker's purpose in saying something. The speaker's expression can be in the form of statement, offer, promise, etc.
- 3) Perlocutionary act is the effect of the illocution on the hearer, such as the effect on the feelings, thoughts, or action of the hearers.

In the other word, locutionary act is the simple act of saying words and the meaning of those words which are spoken by the speaker. Illocutionary act is what is done by the speaker in saying something, and perlocutionary act is the effect that arises when the speaker is saying something.

b. Direct and Indirect Speech Act

Searle (in Cutting, 2002: 19) said that a speaker using a direct speech act wants to communicate the literal meaning that the words conventionally express; there is a direct relationship between the form and the function. Thus, a declarative form (not to be confused with declaration speech acts) such as 'I was going to get another one' has the function of a statement or assertion; an interrogative form such as 'Do you like the tuna and sweet

corn ones?' has the function of a question; and in imperative form such as 'Get me one' has the function of a request or order.

On the other hand, Searle (in Cutting, 2002: 19) explained that someone using an indirect speech act wants to communicate a different meaning from the apparent surface meaning; the form and the function are not directly related. There is an underlying pragmatic meaning, and one speech act is performed through another speech act. Thus a declarative from such as 'I was going to get another one', or 'You get me a tuna and sweet corn one' might have the function of a request or order, meaning 'Get me one', similarly an interrogative form such as 'Could you get me a tuna and sweet corn one please?' has the function of a request or order.

Indirect speech acts are part of everyday life. The classification of utterances in categories of indirect and direct speech acts is not an easy task, because much of what we say operates on both levels, and utterances often have more than one macro-functions (representative, commissive, directive, expressive, and so on).

1) Direct Speech Act

Finch (2000: 183) direct speech act is a speech act that has direct connection with the structure used. In a direct speech act, the sentence meaning and speaker's meaning match with the speaker's meaning, i.e. The form of the utterance is in accordance with what the speaker is intending to convey. Searle (in Cutting, 2002: 19) states that the speakers use direct speech act to communicate the literal meaning that the words conventionally express;

there is a direct relationship between the form and the function (declarative, imperative and interrogative).

Clark and Clark (1977: 28) note that telling is usually done with declaratives, questioning, with interrogatives are used to question about some states of affair and imperatives are used to request or order something are all direct speech acts. For example, (a) Andrea picks up the phone; (b) Did Andrea pick up the phone? (c) Pick up the phone, Andrea! In (a) the speaker asserts that Andrea picks up the phone, in (b) the speaker asks whether or not Andrea picks up the phone, while (c) the speaker requests/commands Andrea to pick up the phone.

2) Indirect Speech Act

Finch (2000: 183) states that indirect speech act occurs when there is an indirect relationship between a surface structure and function and in indirect speech act, the speaker means what the sentence means but something else as well. Searle (in Cutting, 2002: 19) also explains that someone who uses an indirect speech act wants to communicate a different meaning from the apparent surface meaning; the form and function are not directly related (statements, question, command/request).

Yule (1996: 55) gives some examples where the speaker wants the hearer not to stand in front of the TV. The basic function of all utterances is a command or requests but only the imperative structure in (a) represents a direct speech act. The interrogative structure in (b) is not being used only as a question but also as an indirect request. The declarative structure in (c) is also

an indirect request. Example: (a) Move out of the way! (b) Do you have to stand in front of the TV? (c) You're standing in front of the TV

c. Speech Act Classification

Searle (in Levinson, 1983: 240) proposes that in speaking, one can perform five basic kinds of illocutionary acts, namely:

- a) Representatives or Assertives: the speech functions to assert something. This class includes: stating, claiming, suggesting, insisting, criticizing, boasting, predicting, hypothesizing, describing, and complaining. For example: "I bought the book yesterday".
- b) Directives: the speech functions to ask someone to do something. This class includes: requesting, questioning, demanding, ordering, asking, advising, commanding, daring, forbidding, inviting, defying, and challenging. For example: "will you close the door please?".
 - c) Commisives: the speech functions to promise something to someone.

 This class includes: promising, threatening, offering, refusing, volunteering, intending, vowing, assuring, to do or to refrain from doing something. For example: "I will take you to the zoo tomorrow".
- d) Expressives: the speech functions to express feeling. This class includes: thanking, congratulating, deploring, condoling, praising, mocking, welcoming, and apologizing. For example: "I am very exited today".
- e) Declarations: the speech functions to change the state of affair in this world. This class includes: blessing, firing, baptizing, bidding,

passing, sentence, excommunicating. For example: "I bet you ten dollar".

2.1.2 Speech Act of Refusal

Refusals are considered to be face-threatening act because they contradict the listener's expectation (Chen, 1995). Refusal is an expression which is expressed by saying 'no' but it is not easy. Blum-Kulka (1982: 30-31) mentions that it is not common in English to express refusal by saying 'no' or to say 'no' in response to a request for information (for example in shops, hotels, restaurants).

Felix-Brasdever in his book which entitles Politeness in Mexico and United States: a Contrastive Study of The Realization and Perception of Refusals (2008: 42) states that the speech act of refusals represents one type dispreferred response. Refusal expression has to be used in an appropriate form and the function depends on the context.

This expression includes of speech act especially commisives speech act which the word commits to future action. According to Searle (1977) refusals belong to the category of commisives because they commit the refuter to performing an action. Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) explain that refusal expression can be expressed directly, indirectly and adjunct. These are the classifications of refusal expression:

Direct refusals	Indirect refusal	Adjunct to refusals
Performative	Statement of regret	Statement of positive
Non-performative	Wish	opinion/feeling or
	Excuse, reason,	agreement
	explanation	Statement of empathy
	Statement of alternative	Pause fillers
	Set condition for future	Gratitude/appreciation
	or past acceptance	
	Promise of future	
	acceptance	
	Statement of principle	
	Sta <mark>tement of philos</mark> ophy	
	Attempt to dissuade	
	interlocutor	
	Acceptance that	
	functions as a refusal	
	Avoidance	

Table 2.1 The Classification of Refusal Expressions

A. Direct Refusals

1. Performative

The speaker usually is in the speech such as "I refuse..." which based on Leech (1996: 215) states that performatives are self-

naming utterances. The performative verb usually refers to the act in which the speaker is involved at the moment of speech.

2. Non performative

- "no", saying "no" for refusing is common and it shows that the speaker refusing directly.
- Negative willingness/ability

The use of negative willingness is showed by speaker by saying "I can't...", "I won't...", "I don't think so..."

B. Indirect Refusals

1. Statement of regret

In the statement of regret, the speaker feels sorry or regret and it can be showed by saying "I'm sorry...", "I feel terrible..."

2. Wish

The speaker uses the statement of wish for refusing by saying "I wish I could help you..."

3. Excuse, reason, explanation

Commonly, people use this category for refusing which they give reason or explanation. "my children at home...", "I'm headache..." are the examples.

4. Statement of alternative

The speaker gives the alternative such as "I'd rather...", "I'd prefer..." or "why don't you ask someone else?..."

5. Set condition for future or past acceptance

In this situation, the speaker gives an opportunity for the hearer by past acceptance in which the hearer does not ask the speaker. It can be shown by saying "if you had asked me earlier, I would have..."

6. Promise of future acceptance

Promising is another strategy for refusing which can be performed as "I'll do it next time...", "I promise I'll...", "next time I'll..."

7. Statement of principle

The speakers use their principle for refusing which can be shown by saying "I never do business with friends..."

8. Statement of philosophy

Saying statement philosophy is one of strategies for refusing indirectly. For example the speaker will say "help one, help all"

9. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

In this strategy, the speaker uses:

- Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester. "I won't be any fun tonight..." this is the example to refuse an invitation.
- Guilt trip, the example of this situation can be shown on waitress to customers who want to sit a while: "I can't make a living off people who just order coffee..."
- Criticize the request/requester (statement of negative feeling or opinion; insult/attack. This is the example "who do you think you are?", "that's terrible idea!"

- Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.
- Let interlocutor off the hook
- Self-defense, it is the example: "I'm trying my best...", "I'm doing all I can do..."

10. Acceptance that functions as a refusal

- Unspecific or indefinite reply
- Lack of enthusiasm

11. Avoidance

- Non-verbal
 - Silence
 - Hesitation
 - Doing nothing
 - Physical departure
- Verbal
 - Topic switch
 - Joke
 - Repetition of part request
 - Postponement
 - Hedge

C. Adjunct to Refusals

1. Statement of positive opinion/ feeling of agreement

This statement can be shown as "That's good idea...."; "I'd love to...."

21

2. Statement of empathy

Example: "I realize you are in difficult situation"

3. Pause fillers

Example: "oh..."; "well..."; "uhm..."

4. Gratitude/appreciation

Example: "thanks, but..."

2.1.3 The Concept of Context of Situation

Context is one of the factors that give an effect to people how they use the language. According to Asher (1994: 731) context is one of those linguistic terms which are constantly used in all kinds of context but never explained. It has the relationship with meaning and they are important in pragmatics. Finnegan et al. (1997: 345) state that the essential element in the interpretation of an utterance is the context in which it is uttered. The context can influence the speaker on how to use the language. Yule (1996: 21) states that context simply means the physical environment in which a word is used. The importance of taking of context into account is also well expressed by Hymes (in Brown and Yule, 1983: 37) who views the role of the context in interpretation as, on the one hand, limiting the range of possible interpretation and, on the other hand, as supporting the intended interpretation:

"The use of linguistic form identifies a range of meanings. A context can support a range of the meanings. When a form is used in a context, it eliminates the meaning possible to that

context other than those the form can signal: the context eliminates from consideration the meanings possible to the form other than those the context can support."

Besides, Mey (1993: 39-40) states that context is more than a matter of reference and of understanding what things are about. It gives a deeper meaning to utterances. The utterance "It is a long time since we visited your mother", when uttered in the living room by a married couple, has a totally different meaning from it is uttered by a husband and wife while they are standing in front of the hippopotamus enclosure at the zoo, in which it can be considered as a joke.

a. Context of situation

All of the language has a context. The 'textual' features are enabled to cohere the textual itself and with its context of situation. Halliday and Hasan (1985: 45-46) analyzed the context of situation into three components which are consistent with the three multifunction in discourse field. This allows us to display the redundancy between text and situation, how each component serves to predict the other component. The three components are:

Field of discourse or the 'play': the kind of activity, as recognized
in the culture, within which the language is playing some part
(predict experiential meaning)

- Tenor of discourse or the 'player': the actors or rather the interacting roles that are involved in the creation of the text (predict interpersonal meaning)
- 3. Mode of discourse or the 'parts': the particular function that are assigned to language in this situation, and the rhetorical channel that is therefore allotted to it (predict textual meaning)

The context of situation, as defined in this terms is immediate environment in which a text is actually functioning. This concept has a function to explain why certain things have been said or written on this particular occasion, and what else might have not been said or written. The reason of the researcher in using a context of situation is because the context of situation is important for the reader in order to know the intended meaning of the utterance.

b. Cultural or social context

Malinowski in Halliday and Hasan (1986: 6) defines context of situation as environment of the text including the verbal and the situational environment in which the text is uttered. The linguistic interaction involves not only the immediate sight and sound surrounding the event but also the whole cultural history that is behind the participants and the kind of practices that they are engaging in.

2.1.4 To Kill a Mockingbird by Harper Lee

Scout and Jem Finch are growing up in the tired old Alabama town of Maycomb. Their father, Atticus, is the local lawyer and as a single

parent tries to raise his children with honor and respect to their individualism. With the Depression on times are hard, and there is no money to be found anywhere in town.

To amuse themselves Scout, Jem, and their best friend Dill begin a relentless campaign during their summertimes to get Boo Radley, their reclusive, legendary neighbor, to come out of his house. They concoct endless schemes and even go so far as to create a play that details Boo's life. Atticus forbids them to have anything to do with Mr. Radley, urging them to let the poor man be.

Atticus is a good man, and one day takes on a case that affects him personally. A black man, Tom Robinson, is accused of beating and raping a white woman, Mayella Ewell. Most of the county is convinced immediately that Tom is guilty of the crime, and begin to look at Atticus in a very negative way for actually defending him and trying to do right by him.

As the trial begins it becomes apparent to Scout and Jem that there is no way that Tom Robinson could have beaten and raped Mayella Ewell, as his left hand is crippled. Atticus proves that to the jury, and Scout and Jem are astonished when Tom is slapped with a guilty verdict anyway. They begin to realize that many people in town are very prejudiced against blacks, and their hearts are saddened by it. Time crawls past, and finally Bob Ewell is good to his word and attacks the children Halloween night with a knife. He breaks Jem's arm and almost kills Scout, but Boo Radley,

of all people, comes to their rescue and saves them. The sheriff, Heck Tate, hushes the whole thing over so Boo Radley will not be dragged into the spotlight, and Scout is thrilled to finally get to meet the man they for so long fantasized about. As she walks him back home, she realizes that all this time he was watching them from his front porch windows, and just for a little while she is able to stand in his shoes.

