CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter focuses on theories that are related to this study. These theories are taken from some resources to maintain objectivity. The theories of directives by Ervinn-Tripp (cited in Wolfson 1989), social factors by Holmes (2001), and preference by Yule (1996) which are used by writer to analyze the data in order to answer the research question.

2.1 Speech Acts

According to Yule (1996), in expressing what they want to say, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, they attempt to perform action via those utterances. For example, if one works in situation where a boss has a great deal of power, then the boss’s utterance “You’re fired” is more than just a statement. In that case, this utterance can be used to perform the act of ending his employment.

Based on Yule’s classification (1996, p.51), “there are five types of general functions performed by speech acts, which are declarations, representatives, expressives, directives and commisives”. Declaration are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance. The other functions of speech acts is representatives that are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Moreover, the next functions is expressives, they are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels. Next types of functions o speech acts are commisives. They are those kinds o speech act that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. The last types is directives. They are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone to do something. They express what the speaker wants and can be command, orders, requests and suggestions. Furthermore, they can be positive, as in this utterance : “Open the window.” or negative, as in this utterance : “Don’t open the window.”
2.2 Directives

Directives is a kind of speech act that often used by speakers in daily conversation. In using directive, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the word via the hearer. Directive show a strong relationship between speaker and hearer. Directive speech acts are used to get greatest attention from listener in communication. Through directive speech act the speaker utterances make hearer do something. In conversation, directive is often used by speaker but they say in different way. The speaker has to concern about situation and context to make the hearer do as they want. Situation in conversation can be seen in some aspects, such as who is the hearer, what things speaker wants to say, and time of conversation.

In addition, for example, there are many obvious and direct ways of getting someone to sit down:

-Sit down
-Please take a seat
-Would you please sit down?

There are also many indirect forms such as:

Your legs must be tired
Your legs must be worn out
Here’s a seat

Based on Holmes (2001), directives are used to get people to do things. We can attempt to get people to sit down, for instance, by inviting them to do so, or by ordering them to sit down. There are many ways to expressing directives. Directives such as orders and commands are generally expressed in imperative form that is used between people who know each other well.
2.3 Social Factors

The way people talk is influenced by the social context in which they are talking. Based on Holmes (2001), social factors can influence the choice of appropriate ways of speaking in different social contexts. Some social factors relate to the users of language, and others relate to its uses—the social setting and function of the interaction. Who is talking to whom (e.g., boss-worker) is an important factor. The social context or setting (e.g., home, work) is a relevant factor too. The topic and the function of speaking can be grouped in ways that are helpful.

2.4 Six Categories of Directives

As cited in Wolfson (1989), Ervin Tripp classifies directives into six types that include the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

1. Need Statements

Need statements are one type of directives that usually occur in transactional work settings and in the family. The structure is I want/need/would like + Object.

For example:  
- Manager to secretary: I want you to postpone the meeting
- Doctor to nurse: I need my stethoscope

Here, the word need can be a key to need statements. Besides need, the speaker can use want, ask, or would like. Therefore, this type is to express what the speaker wants.

2. Bald imperative

This type is used more frequently within a family or by superiors to subordinates, and between peers. A bald imperative is the most direct request. The structure is V + object + of the action in bald imperative, the speaker may add please, may express the beneficiary of the action or not (e.g., leave me
alone, me is beneficiary) and may add tag (e.g. buy me an apple, ok? Ok is the tag). The speaker may also leave off the verb if the context is clear.

For the example:  

Turn off the radio.

Get out of my room.

Please help me.

3. Imbedded imperative

This type that might appear in two cases the first one is in the work setting, usually by subordinate to his/her superior. The second’s one is in the personal setting with strangers. This types occurs when there are two people who do not each other well and they do not to express their request directly. This category usually begins with “could/would you”. The characteristic of imbedded imperatives is seen in the form o interrogative

(Modal + you + verb + object of the action)

For example:  

would you attend the meeting, Sir?

May you teach me this?

Imbedded imperatives are also more polite than imperatives because the implication o the word “could/would” that asking addressee to try to do something. Imbedded imperatives also recognizes the use o hedges such as “if you are not tired, would you please cook noodles for me?”. “If you are not tired” here is the hedges. Besides the use of hedges, the use of please is common.

4. Permission directives
A permission directive is one of types that ask someone else to give permission to the speaker to do something. Permission directive are used to superiors in the family and also work place. Like embedded imperative this type is also in the form of interrogative. The structure is:

\[(\text{Modal} + \text{I} + \text{verb} + \text{action})\]

The difference is that this type uses I as a subject, not you as in the Imbedded imperative.

For example: Can I have a glass of coffee? (Permission directives)

Can you clean my car?(Embedded imperatives)

5. Non-explicit question directives

It is in the form of interrogative. The speaker usually makes request indirectly because the power relationship is unspecified. In addition, this type does not use “Please” the form is:

\[(\text{To be} + \text{subject}?)\]

For example: Aren’t we running out of time?

The meaning implied in this type of request includes being uncertain because it declares a condition that would cause rejection of the action requested.

6. Hints

This type is used within closed networks and when the shared knowledge between the participants is at the greatest. Moreover, in hints, the speaker does not directly say what the request is.

For example:

Our room’s is so messy. (It’s mean clean it up)
2.5 Preference

In everyday interaction, when speaker utters directives to the addressee might give the speaker acceptance or even refusal as response. These two belong to the term called preference. Furthermore, according to Yule (1996, p.79), “preference is a pattern in which one type of utterance will be more typically found in response to another conversational sequence”. The are two types of preference, which are preferred and dispreferred next’s acts. The preferred next’s is the structurally expected next act as response whereas the dispreferred next acts is the structurally unexpected next acts as a response. If in this case, if someone makes directives, the preferred act will be acceptance and dispreferred next act will be a refusal. For example, when someone says “Can you help me?”, the possible preferred act produced by addressee will be “Sure” while the possible dispreferred next act produced by the addressee will be “I am sorry I have no time left” (Yule, 1996)

Indeed, the pattern associated with a dispreferred second in English are presented as a series of optional elements (Yule, 1996, p.81)

How to do a dispreferred:

a. Delay/hesitate

The dispreferred act is delivered by the addressee by making late or slow response to the speaker by making pause, using *er, em, oh.*

b. Preface

The dispreferred act is delivered with some preface marking their dispreferred status, often by using the partial *well or oh.*

c. Express doubt
The dispreferred act is delivered by the addressee by giving a response to the speaker which shows his or her uncertainty. For example: *I'm not sure, I don’t know.*

d. Make it non-personal
   
The dispreferred act is delivered by the addressee by making it non personal as the response to the speaker’s directives. For example: *everybody else, out there.*

e. Apology
   
The dispreferred act is delivered by the addressee as the addressee tries to mitigate the negative consequence of not complying the speakers directive by apologizing or expressing regret. Such as saying *I’m sorry, what a pity.*

f. Use mitigators
   
The dispreferred act is delivered by the addressee by using mitigators like *really, mostly, sort of, kinda.*

This theory helps the writer in analyzing the types and classify the preference on Cinderella movie.

The example of how to Dispreferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispreferred</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Delay</td>
<td>Pause, er, em, ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preface</td>
<td>Well, oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Express doubt</td>
<td>I’m not sure, I don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Review of related studies.

This chapter consists of previous studies. There are similarities, differences, and also contributions that the writer gets from these previous studies.

2.6.1 The research done by Canary Finn (2006), the title is “A study of types of directives used among library personnel at Petra Christian university.”

This study analyzes about directives utterances that are being used at Petra Christian University. Her research questions are what types of directives used by female part time student toward the staffs of library. Finn also uses the theory of directives by Ervin-Tripp. The methods that she use for her research paper is qualitative method. In order to get source data Finn used tape recorder to record the conversation between female part time student and staffs. The subject was two female part time students. Finn take 30 utterances classified as directives from the interaction between female part time student and male staffs and 30 utterances between female part time student and female staffs.

The similarity between this study and the writer’s study is both studies use the same theory of Ervin Tripp to analyze the data. Furthermore, the difference is the writer focuses on the movie while Finn focuses on the library field. The contribution towards the present study is that the writer can use this previous study as guideline to do his study. It shows the writer about the directives used in working situation. As a subordinate to the staffs, the female part
time students never used need statement. It inspires the writer to find out more about directives as further study.

2.6.2 The research done by Patricia (2007), the title is “Types of Directives and Woman Speech Features used by Supervisor and Subordinates in the Restaurants”.

In her research Patricia wanted to find out types of directives and speech features used both female superiors and female subordinates in restaurant. She also wants to find out the differences of the types of directives and speech features. She used the theory by Ervin Tripp (1989) about the types of directives and the theory by Lakoff about the features of women’s language.

The similarity between Patricia’s study and the writer’s is both are analyzing the types of directives by applying Ervin Tripp’s classification. On the other hand, the differences of both researchers are Patricia also analyzed the features of women’s language while the writer does not do so. In addition Patricia observed the object of the study in a restaurant while the writer observes the script of the movie. Therefore, this previous study will be used as a comparison study to the writer’s study.