**CHAPTER II**

 **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This research is done as the keen of the researcher to crosscheck whether the social phenomena is like what is stated in the theories. In this case putting a framework of the theory is needed before setting a method of the research in order to get the aim of the research.

In this chapter, brief review on related studies is presented at the beginning of the chapter. The next parts are discussion on several theories which later will be used as tool to categorized and describe the data of the research.

1. **Previous Study**

Among the limited researches on children’s DSA, the following discussions are two studies which are related to this research:

1. Research entitled *Preschool Children’s Competence on Directive Speech Act (A Case Study on “Anak Cerdas” Playgroup P2PNFI Regional 2 Semarang)*, by Yuniarti (*Postgraduate Programme Diponegoro University, 2010)*.

The research identifies the realization of preschool children’s comprehension on Directive Speech Act (DSA), the realization of preschool children’s production, and its interrelatedness between preschoolchildren’s comprehension and production on DSA and politeness.

The result of the study shows that in agreeing the DSA, the preschool children may produce utterance (give verbal responses) or do not produce utterance (non-verbal responses). Thus, in refusing the DSA, the preschool children may give verbal responses or non-verbal responses. The development of children comprehension on DSA shows that there are some strategies to minimize the threat toward negative face by using indirect refusal statement; those are giving reasons and giving alternatives. The result of the study on preschool children production on DSA shows that there are two basic types of DSA, those are: ordering and prohibiting. The ordering type is classified into five categories: 1) ordering, 2) requesting, 3) inviting,4) suggesting, and 5) criticizing. Meanwhile the prohibition type is classified into twocategories; prohibiting and preventing. The development of the preschool children onproducing DSA and its interrelatedness with the politeness shows that the preschool children use some directive politeness strategies (based on the theory of Brown and Levinson on politeness) those are: 1) showing pessimism, 2) using hedges, and 3)minimizing the pressure. Meanwhile, giving respect and apologizing strategies appears in preschool children at the age of 5 – 6 years old.

1. ­The second study entitled *The Development of Pragmatic Competence in The Speech Acts of Compliments and Compliment-Responses By Chinese Learner of English During The First Semester of Studying Abroad,* by Kuo-Yun Kuan (Post Graduate Program University of Southern California, 2009).

The study is intended to explore pragmatic development through the speech acts of compliments and compliment-responses. The study addresses the issue of whether there is a developmental path in pragmatics using a combination of a cross-sectional and longitudinal method. The cross-sectional method has compared the influences of students with different proficiency levels on their pragmatic development, while the longitudinal method has kept tracking the same subjects over an academic semester to see whether there are any changes in terms of the strategies implemented and the appropriateness of the language use in a particular context.

The results strongly indicate that there may be a route for pragmatic development. In addition, the results cast some doubt on the justification of the role of modality markers as a predictor of pragmatic competence, and question the relationship between the proficiency level and the pragmatic competence.

In both previous studies, pragmatic competence is used as focus of the studies particularly on subject of Speech Acts. The differences are on the subject of the study and the discussed area of the Pragmatics. The first looks at preschoolers while the second investigates adults. The earlier study focuses on Directive Speech Acts in every year of age of the children while the later discuses the Speech Acts in inter-language pragmatics.

From those two studies, the first one at glance seems similar to this research. However, actually it is different from this research in the way of analyzing the data. The first study does not deeply discuss on how the form of children’s performance on responding and producing DSA. It just categorizes the children’s ability, in every level of age, in responding and producing DSA. While in this study, the linguistic forms of direct and indirect are also described and analyzed in detail.

1. **Literature Study**

As mentioned in the first chapter, certain theories are used as framework to analyze the children’s ability in performing DSA. In this section, the discussion presents several subjects which are set as framework of this research. The topics which are discussed in this part are Children’s Language Development, Children’s Pragmatic Competence, Children’s Language Competence and Performance, Speech Acts Theory, Directive Speech Act, Direct-indirect Speech Acts and The Concept of Preferred-dispreferred speech acts in Responding DSA.

1. **Children’s Language Development**

In study of a child development, language is one aspect which can be used to see the cognition of a child. Although since six weeks a child has already produced language (as cooing then babbling), the first meaningful word (as an utterance) actually occurs around 1,5 years old (Dardjowidjojo 2003:244-258). They can produce various speeches to express their intention. While Steinberg (1982: 147-157) defines the stages as vocalization (babbling to speech), naming and holophrastic, telegraphic, and morphemic-transformational.

Foss and Hakes (1978:264) mention that in producing utterances, children involve three kinds of changes, they are:

1. increasing in numbers, variety, and complexity of semantic concepts expressed in utterance;
2. increasing in children’s knowledge of syntactic structures and rules involved in producing utterance; and
3. increasing in the capacity for performing the production processing required for producing complete well-formed utterance.

While producing utterance, a child also needs environmental input as the way to comprehend an utterance. In term of acquiring a language, the communication context is also an area which a child needs to understand.

The studies so far mostly focus on the growth of formal system, the product of learning process, and so forth. Elliot (1981:149) has a notion that observing the way language used by a child and by other people with him in direct communication is also important because children soon will interact with various kinds of people in society.

1. **Children’s Language Competence and Performance**

Language competence is one’s underlying knowledge of system of language-its rules of grammar, its vocabulary, all the pieces of language and how those pieces fit together (Brown 2000:31). One’s “real” language competence cannot be seen from an observation. Observation only can give the surface of one’s competence on language. Although certain sets of methodologies are already used to investigate one’s language competence, there is no guarantee that the result is going to be the ‘real competence’ of the person. It means that there will be hidden area which cannot be observed although a set of elicitation technique has been used.

However, related to language competence, Language performance is the actual form of using a language. Performance is overtly observable and concrete manifestation or realization of competence (Brown 2000:30). In a school for instance, some elicitations (like test or examination) are needed to measure one’s language competence in certain area as targeted before.

Measuring children’s language competence is even more challenging. Although certain areas of a language are already set to be measured, frequently a researcher finds something surprising. The following example may give perspective on how difficult to elicit a child to speak; in this case a researcher hopes her respondent will produce a directive speech act (a request).

Context : a Researcher (R) offered Arya (3.1), a sweet.

R : *Arya mau ini? Bilang gimana kalo mau ini?*

 Arya, wants this? What do you say if you want this?

Arya : *Kemarin aku beli kayak gitu.*

 Yesterday I bought something like that.

R : *bilangnya gimana dulu, to?*

 How can you say it, first?

Arya : (went over her Mom)

From the example, the researcher cannot say that Arya is not competent on producing directive speech act. It is because of the complexity of children’s condition or mood during the interview time. Different from the language competence, children’s language performance is easier to be observed because the researcher can just observes what the real situation is. Moreover, children’s language performance is also become concrete manifestation of their language competence.

1. **Children’s Pragmatic Competence**

The competence of children in their first language means their ability in producing and understanding the language. Pragmatic competence becomes the key for children in exploring their world and expanding their knowledge. As the nature of language, human uses language to deliver his message to another person. The linguistic forms which are used by people to express their meaning must be different depends on the context. Study of speaker meaning is pragmatics (Yule 1996:3). In another word pragmatics is about *what is* *behind the real uttered*.

Dardjowidjojo (2008: 266) believes that pragmatic is part of language behaviour. The activities of understanding and producing language are gotten since human recognize symbols in his/her world. That is why researches on how children improve their pragmatic competence are also important.

Language would not be acquired at all without exposure during the critical period (Salkind 2006: 227). Critical period for a child to learn language as native speaker is just before he comes to his 12. Critical Age Hypotheses is firstly proposed by Lenneberg (1967) which states that children between 2-12 years old are able to learn any language natively (Dardjowidjojo, 2008: 218). It is not only about how children understand and produce a structure of language but also in which situation that the language is used.

Children’s Pragmatic competence actually has been shown since they were around two years old. In her paper, Astini (2003:4) mentions that children are already competent in indirect speech and politeness. In a case of Tia (2,3), she kept asking for being breastfed although her Mom said: “*Malu kan, dilihat orang*” (Aren’t you shy being looked by many people?). From that data, although the mother did not say “no” directly but Tia understands that her Mom’s refuses her request.

1. **Speech Acts Theory**

Speech Acts occur when people communicate to others. When someone says “the Indonesian Idol has just finished”, the act is not only *the speaking* itself but also can be various acts, such as the act a mother in asking her daughter to sleep, a TV producer who declares his satisfaction, a fan of Indonesian Idol who missed the show, and so forth, depending on which situation when the utterance is produced or used.

 Speech acts are the basic or minimal unit of linguistic communication (Searle 1969: 16). This term is firstly defined by Austin (1962), as the action performed in saying something. The Speech Act Theory says that the action performed when an utterance is produced can be analyzed on three different levels they are locution, illocution, and perlocution (Cutting 2008: 13-14).

The acts from those three levels are explained as below.

a. Locutionary Act

This act is basically ‘what is said’. It means that the act is simply what is uttered as a meaningful linguistic expression. For example when someone says “SBY is the President of Indonesia”, it means that the speaker states information that SBY is the President of Indonesia.

b. Illocutionary Act

This act is actually more about ‘what is the function of the utterance”. When someone says “I’ve just eaten”, it means a lot depending on the purpose of the speaker. It can be information, a rejection (of an offer to have dinner), a command, etcetera. Other forms for this act are inviting, promising, ordering, advising, excusing, and apologising.

c. Perlocutionary Act

This act is actually the effect of an utterance. People might use an interrogative sentence in order to communicate his message that he needs help. For example when someone says “Do you know where the salt is?” instead of just responds with ‘yes’ or ‘no’, the hearer most probably will take him the salt.

Couple years later Searle, as described by Cutting (2008:14-15), then classifies the illocutionary of the Speech Acts into five macro-classes, namely: declarations, representatives, commissives, directives, and expressives. Each class has different characteristics based on the purpose of the speech. The following part is a brief review on characteristic of those classes:

1. Declarations

These are words and expression that change the world by their utterance. The words included in this class are such as ‘I bet’, ‘I declare’, ‘I resign’, ‘I pronounce’, and etc. As an example, this act can make a free-man becomes a prisoner when the judge utters “This court sentences you to five years in prison”.

1. Representatives

These are acts in which the word states what the speaker believes to be the case, such as ‘describing’, ‘claiming’, ‘hypothesising’, ‘insisting’, and ‘predicting’. One of the examples shown in utterance: “I think the owner of this dog never feed it as it looked pale and skinny”.

1. Commisives

This includes acts in which the words commit the speaker to future action, such as ‘promising’, ‘offering’, ‘threatening’, ‘refusing’, ‘vowing’, and ‘volunteering’. When someone says, “I will be a volunteer for a year with this organization”, it means s/he will do a volunteering work sometimes after s/he produces the act of producing the utterance.

1. Directives

This category covers acts in which the words are aimed at making the hearer do something, such as ‘commanding’, ‘requesting’, ‘inviting’, forbidding’, ‘suggesting’, etc. This category is as simple as when someone says “Can you open the door?” which is then followed by a response. The detail explanation and examples will be presented in the next parts (5).

1. Expressives

This group includes acts in which the words state what the speaker feels, such as ‘apologising’, ‘praising’, ‘congratulating’, ‘deploring’, and ‘regretting’. This act is like the expression of “I do really sorry for coming late” or “Congratulation for your promotion, Darling”.

1. **Directive Speech Acts: Direct or Indirect**

As mentioned before that Directive Speech Act (DSA) aims at the hearer (H) to do something for the speaker (S). In order to make hearer does as the speaker wants, both speaker and hearer must have the same understanding on the utterance itself. For instance, when someone says as (1): *“Please, close the door”,* the hearer possibly will automatically close the door or maybe refuse to close the door for some reasons. This condition happens because the utterance (1) is verbally is clear as a request from speaker to the hearer.

However, much of the time, what people mean is actually not in the words themselves but in the meaning implied (Cutting 2008:16). Searle proposes *direct speech act* as wants to communicate the literal meaning that the words conventionally express; there is direct relationship between the form and the function. While *indirect speech act* wants to communicate a different meaning from apparent surface meaning; the form and function are not directly related. For the same meaning as (1), people may say (2):*”Don’t you realize that ~~the cold weather?~~ is because of that opened door?”*. This fact is shown that when people produce an utterance, illocutionary, can be direct and indirect speech.

Here shown that understanding what speaker says is important part in a communication. When people produce an utterance there will be a meaning behind it. Much of the time, what is stated is not really the meaning. As mentioned above, people sometime express his meaning indirectly. Instead of saying ‘get me the salt’, the directive expression is more polite when people use the request indirectly. The existence of direct-indirect speech started from what Austin proposed in his lectures then become a book entitled “How to Do Things with Words”. Actually, many linguistic forms are used to express one’s intention.

In other word, indirect speech act wants to communicate a different meaning from the surface meaning. With the same interrogative form people use the expression into various meaning. Here, context has important role in defining what is implied in the utterances.

In our everyday life, direct indirect speech act is not an easy task because our sensitivity responding an utterance depends on social and cultural dimension. In people’s daily conversation, when responding a DSA, the form of direct and indirect speech acts also occur. The next part will explain the different form of verbal response as the second part of a conversation structure.

1. **The Response of Directive Speech Acts : Preferred and Dispreferred**

In responding a DSA, H can give different responses as what s/he prefers, verbally and non-verbally. The non-verbal responses easily can be formed as an action of *doing* what is stated by the S, while verbal responses can be more complicated.

A DSA plus its verbal response can be described as a pair of utterances. This pair of utterances also involves the social factor where people can get the same point of view over a message without losing someone else’s face. For instance, a request typically will be followed by an acceptance in order to maintain the relationship between the S and H (see the politeness concept proposed by Brown and Levinson in 1987). This pair is like day to day conversation which generally has a certain structural pattern. This pattern is then called as *preference* which is an observed pattern in talk and not a personal wish (Yule 1996:79).

However, the H’s verbal response is not always in line with the S’s DSA. A request sometime can be followed by a refusal or rejection. In the structure of preference which proposes by Yule (1996), this refusal is called as dispreffered. Following Levinson’s concept (1983), Yule classified the preference as the second part of a conversational structure. He divides the second part into preferred and dispreffered social acts. Preffered is structurally expected next act and dispreferred is structurally unexpected next act (Yule 1996:97).

For further explanation, the following table gives the concept of a conversation structure which is adapted from Yule’s examples:

Table 2.1 Structure of Conversation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| First part (request) | Second part |
| Can you open the window? | (1) Sure.(2)Why not.(3) I’d love to, but can’t you see what I’m doing?(4) Well, I think it is windy outside. |

As shown in the above example, the second part as the response of a DSA (requesting) can be formed into two types, preferred and dispreferred. When the second part is expressed directly without delay, structurally simple, and clear, it is categorized as preferred, as in (1) and (2). In contrast, as in (3) and (4), when the first part is followed by utterance which is unclear, delayed, hedged, and accompanied by explanation, excuses or justification, it means a dispreferred act (Weatherall *et al*. 2007: 210). In the following table, Yule (1996:81) even concretely proposes some ways if someone want to refuse or reject one’s request, command, offer, and so forth.

Table 2.2 The Ways to Do Dispreferred

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How to do a dispreferred** | **Examples** |
| 1. delay/hesitate
 | pause; er; em; oh |
| 1. preface
 | well; oh |
| 1. express doubt
 | I’m not sure; I don’t know |
| 1. token Yes
 | that’s great; I’d love to |
| 1. apology
 | I’m sorry; what a pity |
| 1. mention obligation
 | I must do X; I’m expected in Y |
| 1. appeal for understanding
 | you see; you know |
| 1. make it non-personal
 | everybody else;out there |
| 1. give an account
 | too much work; no time left |
| 1. use mitigators
 | really; mostly; sort of; kinda |
| 1. hedge the negative
 | I guess not; not possible |