II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to know why this research should be conducted, this chapter deals with several points, namely literature review that deals with concept of Inter-language pragmatics, politeness, politeness strategy, speech act, and act of request.

2.1 Inter-language Pragmatics

Inter-language pragmatics (ILP) is a second-generation hybrid. As its name betrays, ILP belongs to two different disciplines, both of which are interdisciplinary. As a branch of Second Language Acquisition Research, ILP is one of several specializations in inter-language studies, contrasting with inter-language phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. As a subset of pragmatics, ILP figures as a sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, or simply linguistic enterprise, depending on how one defines the scope of "pragmatics."

Inter-language pragmatics is “the branch of second language research which studies how nonnative speakers understand and carry out linguistic action in a target language, and how they acquire [second language (L2)] pragmatic knowledge” (Kasper, 1992: 203). It has also been described as the study of non-native speakers use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993: 3). It is defined more narrowly by Kasper
and Dahl (1991: 216) as “the performance and acquisition of speech acts by L2 learners”. Inter-language pragmatics is interested in illocutionary force and politeness of speech acts performed by nonnative speakers, in addition to the development of communicative competence.

2.2 Concept of Speech Acts
Speech act is a part of pragmatic, a subfield of linguistic that studies the way in which context contributes to meaning. According to Leech (1983), pragmatics is the way speakers and writers accomplish goals as social actors who do not just need to get things done but must attend to their interpersonal relationships with other participants at the same time. It studies the real meaning of an utterance related to its context. Searle (2001) states that speech act is a theory that study the language based on the relation of an utterance with the act performed by the speaker. This stands for the idea that language is a means of communications and an utterance will only have meaning if it is performed in a real act, for example making statement, question, command and request.

2.3 Types of Speech Act
There are some theories about types of speech acts. One of them is theory from Searle (1975). Searle uses the terms ‘propositional content’ (the literal meaning of an utterance) and ‘illocutionary force’ (what the speaker intends by what is said) to distinction about speech act.
In his ‘Indirect Speech Acts’ (1975), Searle differentiates between direct and indirect speech acts, the explanation as following:

a. Direct speech acts

Direct speech acts are those in which the propositional content (i.e., ‘what is said’) carries one illocutionary force (i.e., ‘what is meant’). For example, if the speaker says to the hearer ‘Please walk the dog’ and by that means that the hearer should put on a pair of shoes and weather-appropriate apparel, put a leash on the dog, exit the house, and proceed down the street, the speaker is performing a direct request.

In direct speech acts, there is a connection between the literal meaning and the conventional meaning, or between the form and the function of the utterance.

b. Indirect speech acts

Searle (1979:60) defines an indirect speech act as an act performed ‘by means of another’, and states that in indirect speech acts the speaker communicates more than is actually said. For example: If the speaker utters the statement, ‘The dog is whining,’ and by that implies that the hearer should put on a pair of shoes and weather-appropriate apparel, put a leash on the dog, exit the house, and proceed down the street, the speaker is performing an indirect request.

In indirect speech acts, the literal meaning and the conventional meaning are different.
Whereas indirect speech acts are a normal occurrence in everyday language use, Searle is concerned with explaining how it is possible for the speaker to generate them and for the hearer to interpret them. He proposes that this can be accomplished because both the speaker and the hearer share the same linguistic and nonlinguistic background information which allows them to create an implicature and make correct inferences, respectively. In particular, he suggests that mutual understanding is possible due to the cooperative principles of conversation (Grice, 1975), the factual background information and accepted conventions that interlocutors share, and the power of inference (Searle, 1975: 61).

The illocutionary force of some indirect speech acts can be interpreted based on their conventional use. Searle (1979: 65-67) provides a long list of examples of structures conventionally used to perform indirect requests in English. He divides them into the following groups: sentences concerning the hearer’s ability to perform an act (e.g., ‘Can you walk the dog?’); sentences concerning the speaker’s wish or want that the hearer will do an act (e.g., ‘I would like you to walk the dog’); sentences concerning the hearer doing an act (e.g., ‘Will you walk the dog?’); sentences concerning the hearer’s desire or willingness to do an act (e.g., ‘Would you mind walking the dog?’); sentences concerning reasons for doing an act (e.g., ‘You should walk the dog’); and sentences embedding one of the above elements inside another or embedding an explicit directive illocutionary verb inside one of the above (e.g., ‘Would it be too much if I suggested that you could possibly walk the dog?’). While Searle’s categories of indirect requests are
not going to be used in the study proposed here, they are interesting in that they show a wide the range of structures used to perform conventionally indirect requests.

While Austin proposes the distinction between locution, illocution, and perlocution, the explanation as following:

a. Locutionary act

Locutionary act is the basic of utterance that is producing a meaningful linguistics expression. In performing a locutionary act, a speaker uses an identifiable expression, consisting of a sentence or fragment of sentence from language. Example: This room is so hot.

b. Illocutionary act

Illocutionary act is an act of doing something; it is uttered by the speaker that is not only to say or state something but also it is used to ask someone else to do something. In utterance, speaker performs an illocutionary act in using a particular locution to refer. Such utterance has illocutionary act force of a statement, a confirming, a denial, a prediction, a promise, a request, etc. Identifying illocutionary act is harder than locutionary act, it requires us to consider who the speaker is, to whom he is talking to, and when and where did the utterance takes place.

c. Perlocutionary act

Perlocutionary act is an act that is uttered to affect the listener. An utterance that is uttered by someone often has effect to the listener. Which can be expected or unexpected affect that created by the speaker. So, in other word, a perlocution is listener behavioral response to the meaning of
the utterance, not necessarily physical or verbal response, perhaps merely a mental or emotional response.

Example: When we hear someone say “The room is so hot” and we turn on the Air conditioner as a proof that we actually understand the intention of the speaker.

2.4 Acts of Request

Trosborg (1994:187) states that a request is an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker and, sometimes, for the hearer. Request may be expressed in two ways; they are verbal and non-verbal goods and services. The verbal goods and services is a request for information, whereas the non-verbal is a request for object, an action or some kind of service, etc. The purpose of a request is to involve the hearer in some future action which has positive consequences for the speaker and may imply costs to the hearer.

Act of request belongs to the Directives Act based on Searle (1976) classification of illocutionary act. Directives are linguistic utterances to get people to do something. The directives act can be performed in the form of interrogative, declarative, and also imperative which will bring various force in strength.

In the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) (1989), Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper identify a series of components that requests can be comprised of and list eight different strategy types of the performance of the
‘request proper,’ i.e., the head act. Thus, in addition to the head act request itself, a request can contain alerters, supportive moves, and internal modifications. Alerters precede the head act and function as attention-getters. Titles, last and first names, nicknames, endearments or offensive terms, personal pronouns, expressions such as ‘Excuse me,’ and combinations of these means can serve as alerters. Supportive moves are used to mitigate or aggravate requests.

The head act itself can also be realized using a variety of strategies. Bloom-Kulka et al. (1989) list three levels of directness and nine strategy types: direct strategies (mood derivable, performatives, hedged performatives, obligation statements, and want statements); conventionally indirect strategies (suggestory formulae and query preparatory); and non-conventionally indirect strategies (strong hints and mild hints). The summary of request strategies and strategy examples are provided in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Summary of different levels of directness used to realize request proper (adapted from Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989, p. 18)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of directness</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Mood derivable (imperatives)</td>
<td>Walk the dog!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performatives (the illocutionary force is explicitly named)</td>
<td>I am telling you to walk the dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedged performatives</td>
<td>I would like you to walk the dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligation statements</td>
<td>You’ll have to walk that dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Want statements</td>
<td>I want you to walk that dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventionally indirect</td>
<td>Suggestory formulae</td>
<td>How about walking the dog?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Query preparatory (references to ability and willingness)</td>
<td>Would you mind walking the dog?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconventionally indirect</td>
<td>Strong hints (partial reference to object or element that requires the act)</td>
<td>The dog is full of energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mild hints (no reference to object or element that requires the act)</td>
<td>It’s gorgeous outside!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category I - Indirect Request Strategy**

1 - Hints

A speaker who does not want to state his/her Impositive intent explicitly has resort to hinting strategies. By making a statement, for example describing an undesired state of affairs or by asking a question the requester can imply to his/her listener what he/she wants done. The requester can leave out the desire action altogether (mild-hint) or the speaker can mention his/her wish partially (strong-hint).

The examples can be illustrated as follows:

(1) I’m to be at the airport in half an hour (and my car has just broken down).
(2) The kitchen is a total mess
(3) Has the car been cleaned (already)?

(Trosborg: 1994)

When interpreting a hint, it is often necessary to possess intimate knowledge of the other person, to have specific background knowledge, to be aware of specific situational features, etc. the utterance (1) can hardly be interpreted as a request to borrow the hearer's car without the information given in brackets, unless the hearer possesses specific back-ground information; in (2), the hearer must figure
out for him/herself whether the speaker wants the table to be cleared, the dishes to be done, the floor to be washed, etc., while in (3), the desired act is specified in the proposition, and the speaker only omits explicit mention of the hearer as the agent.

Hints strategy involves the condition, as follows:

a. Reasonableness

   Stating some general condition which indicates the speaker's reason for making his/her request is a useful way of indirectly conveying an impositive intent (of the 'reasonableness precondition' referred to by Haverkate, 1984).

   Example: Would you do the dishes? The kitchen is a total mess

b. Availability

   Questioning some condition that would present an obstacle to compliance (if not fulfilled) is another way of giving a hint.

   Example: Is there any coffee left!

c. Obviousness

   Speaker conveys his/her desire obviously.

   Example: Has the letter already been typed?

Category II - Hearer-oriented conditions (Conventionally Indirect)

Strategy 2: Asking Permission

Strategy 2 consists of questioning hearer's permission, for example:

   (1) May I borrow your car?

   (2) May I come to your home?
Strategy 3: Ability or Willingness

Strategy 3 consists of questioning hearer's ability or willingness and Statements of ability and willingness. The first depends on the ability of the hearer's capacity in performing the act and the hearer’s willingness in performing the act, for example:

(1) Maybe you could help John dig the garden tomorrow?

(2) Would you lend me a copy of your book?

The latter depends on hearer that cannot give any excuses because speaker has conveyed that he/she considers this condition is fulfilled and anticipates compliance.

(4) Mary, you can clear the table now.

Strategy 4 - Suggestory formulae

A request can be made by means of various “suggestory formulae”. In this category the requestor uses the ‘formulae’ to turn a request into a suggestion usually in the interest of both speaker and hearer. When employing these formulae, the requestor does not question any particular hearer-based condition, rather he/she tests 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 preposition, the example as follows:

(5) How about lending me some of your records?

(6) Why don’t you come with me?
Category III - Speaker-based conditions (Conventionally Indirect)

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. By placing the speaker's interests above the hearer's, the request becomes more direct in its demand. The speaker's statement of his/her intent may be expressed politely as a wish (Strategy 5) or more bluntly as a demand (Strategy 6).

Strategy 5: Wishes and Desires

In strategy 5 there would be statements of speaker's wishes and desires, for example,

(1) I would like to have some more coffee.

Strategy 6: Needs and Demands

In strategy 6 there would be statements of speaker's needs and demands, for example,

(2) I need a pen.

Category IV — Direct Request

Strategy 7: Obligation and Necessity

In strategy 7 there would be statements of obligation and necessity. The speaker uses his/her own authority in stating his/her desire. For example,

(1) You should/ought to leave now.
Strategy 8: Performatives

Strategy 8 is performatives verb that is considered more or less polite (ask vs. command), for example,

(2) I ask/request/order/command you to leave.

Strategy 9: Imperative

Strategy 9 is the imperative that is grammatical form directly signaling that the utterance is an order (this can be also added by adding tags and/or the marker please) as in the example bellow:

Example: Open the door, please.

Two coffee, please.

In order to make it more detail, the request strategies based in Trosborg shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Indirect request</td>
<td>Hint</td>
<td>Will you be using your car tonight?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>CID (hearer-oriented conditions)</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td>May I borrow your car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability / Willingness/</td>
<td>Could you lend me your car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestory formulae</td>
<td>Would you lend me your car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How about lending me your car?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>CID (speaker-based conditions)</td>
<td>Wishes and Desires</td>
<td>I would like to borrow your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs and demans</td>
<td>I want/need to borrow your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Direct Request</td>
<td>Obligation and necessity</td>
<td>You must/have to lend me your car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Open the door, please!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performatives</td>
<td>I ask/request you to leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on all of theories of request strategies that had explained above, the researcher will use Trosborg taxonomy of request in analyzing the data. The reason is because Trosborg taxonomy of request had included some theories of strategies in act of request.

2.5 Politeness

Politeness is the term we use to describe the extent to which actions, including the way things are said, match addressees’ perceptions of how they should be performed (Grundy, 2000). Beside that Holmes (1995) goes into more detail: politeness will be used to refer to behavior which actively expresses positive concern for others, as well as non-imposing distancing behavior.

Generally, politeness involves the consideration of other people’s feelings. According to Coates (2004), Brown and Levinson (1978) use the term face to explain politeness. Face means the public self-image of a person, and politeness in an interaction can be interpreted as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face. A person may have a positive face, i.e. a need to be accepted or liked, and also a negative face, a need to be independent and not to be imposed on (Yule, 1996: 60-61).

While Leech (1983:81) defines the politeness principle as minimize the expression of impolite beliefs, Cruse (2000:362) defines politeness as first and foremost, a matter of what is said, and not a matter of what is thought or believed. He prefers the statement “choose expressions which minimally belittle or
In dealing with the act of request, someone have to pay attention on the politeness principle in order to keep the communications flow. That is when someone is having a conversation and they want to show a politeness to the person they are talk to, this principle is applied. Politeness principle is also important to keep the social relationship and the geniality in a conversation. Only then someone could expect that the existance of conversations can be maintained (Leech, 1983:82).

2.6 Politeness Strategy

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategies are developed to save the hearer’s face. Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that “self-esteem” in public or in private situations. Their notions of ‘face is derived from that of Goffman (1967, as cited in Brown and Levinson 1987) and from the English folk term, which is related to notions of being embarrassed or humiliated, or ‘losing face’.

According to Brown and Levinson, Face Threatening Acts (FTA's) are acts that infringe on the hearers' need to maintain his/her self esteem. If we do or are about threaten someone’s positive or negative face, but do not mean it, we need to minimize it by applying politeness strategies that are Bald on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off-the-Record (as suggested by Brown and Levinson, 1987).
The possible sets of strategies that Brown and Levinson (1987) propose in relation to doing FTAs can be seen in the following chart:

Some kinds of politeness strategy based on Brown and Levinson theory are described in the following points:

1. **Bald on Record Strategy**

   To perform an FTA boldly on record means to perform the act directly (cf. Searle’s distinction between direct and indirect speech acts). Bold on record acts are performed without undertaking redressive action, i.e., without an attempt to save the face.

   The bald on-record strategies does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer’s “face”. It can take the form of:

   a. Emergency: Help!
   b. Task Oriented: Give me those!
   c. Request: Put your jacket away.
   d. Alerting: Turn your lights on! (while driving)

2. **Positive Politeness Strategy**

   Positive politeness strategy is accomplished by appealing to the hearer’s need to be liked and treated as a member of the same group. Examples of appeals to positive face include cases when the speaker demonstrates
closeness and solidarity with the hearer, makes appeals to friendship, makes
the hearer feel good or emphasizes common goals. The positive politeness
strategy shows that you recognize that your hearer has a face to be
respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and express group
reciprocity.

For example:

a. Attend to the hearer: you must be hungry, it’s a long time since
breakfast. How about some lunch?

b. Avoid disagreement:
   A: What is she, small?
   B: Yes, yes, she is small, um, not really small but certainly not very big.

c. Assume agreement: So when are you coming to see us?

d. Hedge opinion: you really should sort of try harder.

Brown and Levinson (1987:101-129) list fifteen different strategies to perform
positive politeness: seeking agreement; avoiding disagreement; joking; offering or
promising; being optimistic; intensifying interest to the hearer; using in-group
identity markers; presupposing or asserting common ground; attending to the
hearer’s interests, wants, needs or goods; exaggerating interest, approval or
sympathy with the hearer; including both the speaker and the hearer in the
activity; giving reasons; and assuming or asserting reciprocity; and giving gifts to
the hearer.
3. **Negative Politeness Strategy**

By doing so, the social distance between the speaker and the hearer is stressed, and the interlocutors avoid encroaching on each other’s territory. Some negative politeness strategies include giving options, using apology for interference or transgression, stressing the importance of one’s values (e.g., time), using conventional politeness markers such as hedges, or impersonalizing strategies such as passive voice (Brown & Levinson, 1987:70).

The negative politeness strategy shows that we recognize the hearer’s face. But it also admits that you are in some way imposing on him or her. For example:

a. Be indirect: i’m looking for a pen.

b. Request forgiveness: you must forgive me but, could I borrow your pen?

c. Minimize imposition: I just want to ask you if I could use your pen.

d. Pluralize the person responsible: We forgot to tell you that you needed to buy your plane ticket by yesterday.

4. **Off-record Strategy**

The off-record means formulate the speech act in an indirect way. Brown and Levinson (1987:211) define an indirect speech act as an act that “is either more general (contains less information in the sense that it rules out fewer possible states of affairs) or actually different from what one means (intends to be understood)”.

In other words, off-record strategies require violation of one or more of Grice’s cooperative maxims. In order to understand an indirect speech act as intended, the
hearer has to make an inference (cf. Grice’s conversational implicature). If the
listener wants to perform an FTA off record, Brown and Levinson (1987: 213)
claim, the hearer needs to receive some hints and draw on contextual clues in
order to correctly interpret the implicature.

Brown and Levinson distinguish fifteen off-record strategies: giving hints; giving
association clues; presupposing; understating; overstating; using tautologies;
using contradictions; being ironic; using metaphors; using rhetorical questions;
being ambiguous; being vague; over-generalizing; displacing the hearer; and
being incomplete (using ellipsis). These strategies produce an illocutionary force
that is likely to be correctly understood by the hearer.

While Leech (1983) and Lakoff (1973, 1977) propose models of politeness in
terms of conversational maxims. Leech proposes a Politeness Principle and six
conversational maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and
sympathy. While Grice’s Cooperative Principle accounts for the relation between
the sense and the illocutionary force of the utterance, Leech argues that the
Politeness Principle with its six maxims is needed to account for the use of
indirectness and for the relationship between the sense and illocutionary force of
non-declarative utterances. That is, in cases where the Cooperative Principle alone
fails to provide a satisfactory explanation, the Politeness Principle can rescue it
(Leech, 1983:80).
2.7 Review of Relevant Research

There has been increasing interest in analyzing the application of politeness by non-native speakers. A number of L2 studies have investigated L2 learner’s production of requests or their perception of politeness level of various request forms. For example the studies conducted by Tanaka and Kawade (1982), Tanaka and Kawade (1982), investigating whether Japanese ESL learners could use politeness strategies in requests in a way similar to the native speakers of English, conducted a study with 53 native speakers of English and 32 Japanese ESL learners. Using a multiple-choice questionnaire, they found that native speakers used more polite strategies in situations where the requester-requestee relationship is distant and less polite strategies in situations in which the requester-requestee relationship is close. Learners did not differ significantly from the native speakers in the use of politeness strategies.

Suh (1999), following Tanaka and Kawade’s (1982) study, conducted another study investigating whether there is any difference between native speakers of English and Korean ESL learners in the use of politeness in request strategies and to what extent do Korean ESL learners at different proficiency levels differ in the use of politeness strategies in requests. Employing a multiple-choice questionnaire, Sue found that advanced and intermediate Korean ESL learners did not differ in their use of politeness strategies.

In Indonesian culture, Wijayanto (2013) had investigated about Indonesian learners’ politeness in speech act of complaints. He found that different status
levels and social distances induced different frequencies of politeness strategies rather than different types of politeness.

### 2.8 Theoretical Assumptions

Having reviewed some previous research about politeness and speech act, the researchers assume that Indonesian’s English Learner’s pragmatic knowledge of the L1 affects the choice to perform speech act. Beside that Indonesian culture and the relationship affects the way of participant conveyed their politeness through their peers in conversation especially politeness in English as a foreign language interaction.

In this chapter, the writer has discussed about literature review of this research dealing with politeness and speech act of request. In the next chapter, the method of this research will be presented.