

## **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part is about the review of related theories, which consists of all the theories used by the writer to help her in answering the research questions. The main theory used in this study is the request strategies proposed by Trosborg (1994) and supported by the theory of social distance, proposed by Holmes (2001). The second part in this chapter is about the review of two previous studies.

### **2.1 Review of Related Theories**

This session will present about request and the request strategies' theory proposed by Trosborg (1994), supported by Blum-Kulka, et.al. (1989) and Aijmer (1996). Trosborg (1994, pp. 192-204) divided the request strategies into four main categories. These four main categories will be divided into ten request strategies. Moreover, the writer uses a theory about social distance proposed by Holmes (2001, p. 9) to support this main theory.

#### **2.1.1 Request**

A request is an illocutionary act whereby a speaker (requester) conveys to a hearer (requestee) that he or she wants the requestee to perform an act, which is for the benefit of the speaker (Trosborg, 1994, p. 187). In line with this, Searle (1979) described request as an attempt by the speaker to get the hearer to do something (as cited in Marquez-Reiter, 2000, p. 35). In other words, request is an utterance or speech that expresses the speaker's wish about something 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, p. 188).

According to Fasold (1990), request can also be defined as an order. Typically, request happens either that the speaker thinks whether he or she is in a sufficiently superior social position for the other person (or the addressee) to be

obliged to carry out the order or request. It also may happen because of the solidarity between the speaker and the addressee is sufficient for that person to be willing to act for the speaker's benefit (p. 58).

Furthermore, the act may be a request for non-verbal goods 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, p. 187). Bach and Harnish (1982) also distinguished requests as requests for action, requests for information, requests for attention, requests for sympathy. However, they all involve a request for an action of some kind from another person (cited in Marquez-Reiter, 2000, p. 35).

Request can be carried out in several ways, for examples by making an order, asking a question, or suggesting something, etcetera (Aijmer, 1996, p. 130). Therefore, there are several different classifications of request strategies done by several experts. One of the experts is Trosborg (1994, pp. 192-204), who classified request into four main categories, namely Indirect Requests, Conventionally Indirect or also known as hearer-oriented conditions, Conventionally Indirect (speaker-based conditions), and Direct Requests as shown in the following figure, figure 2.1. The following figure is adapted from Trosborg (1991, p. 76) and Trosborg (1994, pp. 192-204). Last of all, each strategy will be explained below figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1. Request Strategies

Category I	: Indirect Requests
Strategy I	: <i>Mild Hints</i>
Strategy II	: <i>Strong Hints</i>
Category II	: Conventionally Indirect (Hearer-Oriented Conditions)
Strategy III	: <i>Hearer's Ability</i>
Strategy IV	: <i>Hearer's Willingness</i>
Strategy V	: <i>Suggestory Formulae</i>
Category III	: Conventionally Indirect (Speaker-Based Conditions)
Strategy VI	: <i>Statements of speaker's wishes and desires</i>
Strategy VII	: <i>Statements of speaker's needs and demands</i>

- Category IV : Direct Requests  
Strategy VIII : *Statements of obligation and necessity*  
Strategy IX : *Performatives*  
Strategy X : *Imperatives*

### 2.1.1.1 Indirect Requests

In this category, the speaker makes a request in an indirect way to convey what his or her wants. Thus, the characteristic of Indirect Request is hinting, which can be used when the speaker does not want to express his or her impositive intent explicitly (p. 192). In hinting strategy, the speaker tries to get the hearer to do an action, but he or she omits the desired act and avoids mentioning the hearer as the intended agent. Therefore, the wish can be implied to the hearer, for instance, by making a statement that describes an undesired situation or by asking a question (p. 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 (p. 193). For instance, '*I'm to be at the airport in half an hour (and my car has just broken down).*' 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 (p. 193).

Trosborg (pp. 194-196) suggested that hinting strategies can be seen as involving conditions of reasonableness, availability and obviousness. Firstly is hint through the reasonableness condition. In this condition, the speaker states some general conditions that indicate the speaker's reason for making his/her request. In addition, the reasons are typically expressed as causal clauses supporting the request (p. 194).

Some examples of reasonableness are '*Close the door, please. It's cold in here.*' and '*Get me a drink, will you? I'm so thirsty.*' (p. 194). In the examples given, the second sentence is supporting the request, which is mentioned in the first sentence. By putting the reason for making a request, the speaker is anticipating potential questions from the hearer, while at the same time he or she

provides a justification for asking. Besides, the speaker usually makes statements of reason in making request in order to find out whether the hearer finds his or her reasons for asking reasonable and acceptable (p. 194).

Questioning some conditions that would present an obstacle to compliance (if not fulfilled) is another way of giving a hint. This kind of condition is called availability condition, for example (p. 195):

- '*Is Miss Peterson in?*' The structure in this example could serve as a hint as it explicitly states a condition of decisive importance for requests like '*Can I speak to Miss Peterson?*'.
- '*Are you ready?*' This structure could serve as a hint as it explicitly states a condition of decisive importance for requests like '*Shall we be going?*'.

The last option is hint through the obviousness condition. The speaker conveys his or her desire for the act in question to be performed. 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 do so (p. 196), for example (pp. 195-196), '*Have the dishes been done?*', '*Has the letter already been typed?*', and '*Has Peter taken out the dustbin?*'.

Trosborg divided Indirect Request into two forms, namely *Mild Hints* and *Strong Hints* (pp. 192-193). Each of them will be explained below.

### **A. Mild Hints**

In this strategy, the requester (the speaker) can leave out the desired action altogether (p. 192). In addition, according to Blum-Kulka, et.al. (1989, p. 18), the utterances in *Mild Hints* make no reference to the request proper (or any of its elements) but are interpretable as request by context.

Some instances are '*It's cold in here.*', '*I'm so thirsty.*', and '*The kitchen is a total mess.*'. Based on these examples, the speaker does not explicitly mention the desired action to the hearer, therefore the hearer must figure out for him/herself about the speaker's wishes whether the speaker wants him or her to turn the air conditioner off or turn the heater on, and etcetera (Trosborg, 1994, pp. 192-193).

## **B. Strong Hints**

In this strategy, the requester's wish can be partially mentioned (p. 192). Blum-Kulka, et.al. (1989, p. 18) added that the utterances contain partial reference to object or element needed for the implementation of the act. '*Has the car been cleaned (already)?*' is one of the examples of *Strong Hints*. In this example, the desired act is clearly specified in proposition; however, the speaker only omits explicit mention of the hearer as the agent (Trosborg, 1994, p. 193).

### **2.1.1.2 Conventionally Indirect (Hearer-Oriented Conditions)**

Requests that are hearer-oriented convey that the hearer is in a position of control to decide whether or not to comply with the request (p. 197). There are three request strategies under this second category, namely *Hearer's Ability*, *Hearer's Willingness*, and *Suggestory Formulae* (pp. 197-201).

#### **A. Hearer's Ability**

According to Trosborg (p. 197), in requests employing a hearer-based pre-condition, the hearer must infer that a question concerning his or her ability to carry out the specified act counts as an attempt on the part of the speaker to make the hearer to do so. The condition of ability refers to the hearer's capacity to perform the desired act.

In addition, Aijmer (1996, p. 132) added that ability statements are a request that is asking about the hearer's ability to do something for the speaker. Therefore, this type of request usually uses the term: 'Can you...' (p. 132).

Consider the following examples: '*Can you pass me the butter, please?*', '*Could you lend me some money?*', and '*Could you open the window for me, please?*' (Trosborg, 1994, p. 198). The examples given show that the speaker (requester) questions about the hearer ability to perform a specified act, such as passing the butter to the speaker, lending him/her some money, and opening the window.

## B. Hearer's Willingness

According to Trosborg (p. 199), in *Hearer's Willingness*, the speaker questions concerning the hearer's willingness to carry out the desired act, for example, '*Will you do the shopping today?*', '*Would you lend me a copy of your book?*', and '*Won't you give me a hand?*'. Moreover, request querying the hearer's willingness may be embedded in expressions of appreciation, hope, etcetera on behalf of the requester, for example, '*I'd be grateful if you'd send me a parts list.*' and '*I hope you wouldn't mind giving me a hand.*'.

In addition, according to Aijmer (1996, p. 132), willingness statements are a request that is asking whether the hearer is willing to do something or has any objection to do something. Thus, the usual term of this type is 'Will you...' or 'Would you (like)...' (p. 132).

There is another way of asking about the hearer's willingness to do something, which is by making a request of permission (Trosborg, 1994, p. 199). It involves the requester as the beneficiary or recipient of the activity instead of mentioning the requestee (hearer) as the agent of the action, for instance, '*Can I have the butter, please?*' and '*May/Can I have a match?*' (p. 200).

## C. Suggestory Formulae

When employing this strategy, the requester does not question any particular hearer-based condition, rather he or 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 proposition (p. 201). The speaker is therefore able to make his or her request more tentative and plays down his or her interest as a beneficiary of the action. Some instance are '*How about lending me some of your records?*' and '*Why don't you come with me?*' (p.201).

In line with this, Blum-Kulka, et.al. (1989, p. 18) suggested, a *Suggestory Formulae* is a request which contains a suggestion to do something. According to Tsui (1994, p. 100), a suggestion typically can also be identified by this following form: 'can/could/shall we do X?'. The examples are '*so why don't we arrange to get together maybe Sunday?*' or '*we have to do a few things over.*'. From these

examples, the key point in this strategy is that both, the speaker and hearer do the action and get the benefit.

### **2.1.1.3 Conventionally Indirect (Speaker-Based Conditions)**

In this category, the speaker can choose to focus on speaker-based conditions, rather than querying hearer-oriented conditions, thereby the requester (speaker) will try to make his or her own desires to the focal point of the interaction (Trosborg, 1994, p. 201). In other words, the request is more direct in its demand because the speaker's interests are placing above the hearer's interest. In this category, the speaker's statement of his or her intent may be expressed politely as a wish or more bluntly as a demand (p. 201). Therefore, there are two strategies under this category namely *Statements of Speaker's Wishes and Desired* and *Statements of Speaker's Needs and Demands* (pp. 201-202).

#### **A. Statements of Speaker's Wishes and Desires**

In this strategy, the focus is in the speaker. In other words, the speaker (requester) makes a statement of requests based on his or her wishes and/or desires (p. 201). In line with this, according to Aijmer (1996, p. 132), Wish or desire statements are a request that expresses the speaker's wish(es) about something that the hearer should do. It sounds more polite compared to the second type namely statements of speaker's needs and demands because this strategy uses modal verb 'I would like you to...'. The examples of *Statements of Speaker's Wishes and Desires* are 'I would like to have some more coffee.', 'I would like you to do the gardening today.', 'I would prefer her to visit me.' and 'It would be a big help if you passed me the keys.' (Trosborg, 1994, pp. 201-202).

#### **B. Statements of Speaker's Needs and Demands**

This condition is less polite than the first type, namely wish or desire statements, because the speaker will directly give request to the hearer so that the hearer will perform an act as the speaker's needs and/or demands (p. 202). In addition, the speaker uses the word 'want (I want ....)' or 'need (I need ....)' in making the request. In line with this, according to Aijmer (1996, p. 132), need or

demands statements express the speaker's need or desire for (non-verbal) goods. Here are the examples of *Statements of Speaker's Needs and Demands* are 'I need a pen.', 'I really need a drink.' and 'I want you to sign this for me.' (p. 202).

#### **2.1.1.4 Direct Requests**

In this category, the speaker makes his or her request in explicit way (p. 202). A requester (speaker) who wants to make explicit the illocutionary point of his or her utterance may use a modal verb expressing obligation and/or necessity (*Statements of Obligation and Necessity*). Besides, the speaker may use a *Performatives* or an *Imperatives* statement (pp. 202-204).

#### **A. Statements of Obligation and Necessity**

When employing a *Statement of Obligation and Necessity*, the speaker applies either his or her own authority, or he or she refers to some authority outside the speaker, for instance, institutions, brute facts, and etcetera (p. 202). According to Aijmer (1996, p. 132), this strategy states that the hearer is under the obligation to do the desired action. In a simpler words, the utterances state the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act (Blum-Kulka, et.al., 1989, p. 18).

The structures of this category usually contain 'should' and 'ought to', which 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. Here are some of the examples 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, p. 203).

#### **B. Performatives**

The speaker can convey a request simply by using a performative verb, which explicitly signals the illocutionary force (p. 190). In other words, the inclusion of a performative verb conveying requestive intent, such as 'ask', 'request', 'order', 'demand', 'command', and etcetera, explicitly marks the utterance as an order (p. 203). Performatives statements with requestive intent are very

direct and usually authoritative. In line with this, according to Blum-Kulka et.al. (1989, p. 18), performatives means utterances in which the illocutionary force is explicitly named. The example of performatives is '*I ask/request/order/command you to leave.*' (Trosborg, 1994, p. 203). Moreover, in order to soften this form, it is possible for the requester to hedge the illocutionary force of the utterance. The result is a hedged performatives, as in the following examples (p. 203):

- *I would like to ask you to leave.* (hedged)
- *I ask you to leave.* (unhedged)

### C. Imperatives

The *Imperatives* are the canonical grammatical form for getting somebody to do something (p. 190). In other words, the grammatical form directly signaling the utterance as an order (p. 204). Besides, it is very authoritative; therefore, when there is order issued by authority figures, it must be obeyed. If the speaker has power over the hearer, the latter is obliged to carry out the order, for example, orders from parent to child, from teacher to pupil, from officer to soldier, from employer to employee, etcetera (p. 204).

In *Imperatives*, the grammatical subject (second person pronoun "you") may be deleted from the surface structure. However, when interpreting these structures the addressee is assigned the role of agent of the desired action (p. 190). Some instances are '*Leave the place at once.*' and '*Get out of here.*' (p. 204). Imperatives can also be softened by adding tags and/or the marker '*please*', for examples: '*Open the door, please.*' and '*Leave it to me, will you.*' (p. 204). Elliptical phrases is another way of interpreting an imperatives statement. In Elliptical phrases, the speaker only mentions the desired object for instance '*Two coffee, please.*' and '*A Scotch, please.*' (p. 204).

The writer will use the theories of request strategies as a tool to investigate and classify the kinds of request strategies that the main female character, named Margaret Tate, used in delivering her request expressions to her private male assistant, named Andrew Paxton. Besides the main theory proposed by Trosborg (1994) and the supported theories proposed by Blum-Kulka, et.al. (1989) and Aijmer (1996), the writer also uses a theory of social distance by Holmes (2001)

in order to help her to analyze the status between Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton before and after the contract marriage. There will be further explanations about the theory itself in the next section.

### **2.1.2 Social Distance and Request Strategies**

One of the social dimensions stated by Holmes is social distance (2001, p. 9). Social distance or solidarity usually affects on the suitable language choice because how well the speaker knows the interlocutor will become one of the most important factor influencing the way he or she talks (p. 374).

Talking about social distance, there will be two different terms: distant (low solidarity) and intimate (high solidarity). First, distant may refers to a greater social distance between the speaker and the addressee. It means the speaker and addressee do not know each other well (Pair, 2005, p. 77). On the other hands, intimate may refers to a small social distance between the speaker and the addressee. In other words, the speaker and the addressee know each other well (p. 76).

There is a correlation between social distance and the directness of request. According to a contrastive study of request and apologies done by Marquez-Reiter (2000), the closer the speaker is the more direct the linguistic mapping of the request will be (p. 109). In line with this statement, Holmes (2001, p. 261) also stated people who are intimate use more *Imperatives* (which is under the category of Direct Request). In conclusion, Direct Request are used between people who know each other well, while *Hints* (which is under the category of Indirect Request) tend to be used between those who are less familiar with each other.

By following this theory of social distance, the writer hopes that she will be able to categorize the social distance between Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton, which may influence Margaret's way in giving requests to Andrew before and after the contract marriage. The writer also hopes that she will be able to provide a clear mapping for types of requests spoken by the main female character, named Margaret Tate, to Andrew Paxton, in *The Proposal* movie.

The theory will help the writer to classify them into the request strategies proposed by Trosborg (1994). By doing it, the writer will be able to analyze and

answer the research questions. Besides from theories, previous studies are also important to make this study better, thus, the writer employs two previous studies conducted by Oentoro (2006) and Monica (2006).

## **2.2 Review of Related Studies**

As her related studies, the writer uses two studies from the previous researchers in the same field as this study. The two previous studies were conducted by Oentoro (2006) and Monica (2006).

### **2.2.1 The Request Strategies Used by the Male Superior and the Female Subordinate before and after Having Close Relationship in the Film *Two Weeks Notice* (Oentoro, 2006)**

As stated in the title, Oentoro used *Two Weeks Notice*, a film about an ordinary American work's life with the main characters, named Mr. George Wade and Lucy Kelson. By using this film, she tried to find out the answer of three research questions namely (1) types of request strategies used by Mr. Wade to Lucy before and after they know each other well, (2) types of request strategies used by Lucy to Mr. Wade before and after they know each other well and (3) the differences in making the request strategies before and after they know each other well. In order to answer her research questions, she used the theory of request proposed by Ervin-Tripp (1976).

Her research was a descriptive quantitative approach because she tried to find out the frequency of the occurrence of type of request used by the main characters before and after they know each other well. Her finding showed that the main male superior character, named Mr. Wade, frequently used question Directives (42,8%), while the main female subordinate character, named Lucy, mostly used Question Directives (44,4%) as well as Hint Directives (44,4%), before they had a close relationship. Then, after the solidarity existed, the writer found that both characters regularly used Bald Imperatives (34,4% used by the female character and 35,9% used by the male character). Moreover, her findings showed that Mr. Wade tended to use Question Directive (42,8%) to Lucy before they had a close relationship and use Bald Imperatives (35,9%) after the solidarity

existed. Then, Lucy tended to use Question Directives (44,4%) and Hint Directives (44,4%) when talking to Mr. Wade before they had a close relationship. However, she regularly used Bald Imperatives (34,4%) and Hint Directives (31,2%) to Mr. Wade after they have a closer relationship.

Based on the findings, both the main male and female characters frequently used Bald Imperatives in making requests, although Lucy was considered being subordinate to Mr. Wade. Therefore, the writer concluded that solidarity or familiarity had influenced the type of requests.

There is only one similarity and three differences between the present writer's study and Oentoro's study. Both studies observed a movie as their source of data. However, Oentoro's study was different from the present writer's study since Oentoro analyzed the utterances spoken by both of the main characters when they talked to each other. However, in the present writer's study, she only analyzed the utterances spoken by one main character, which is the main female character towards the main male character, while ignoring the utterances spoken to the other characters in the movie. Also, the present writer did not use the same theory as Oentoro's study because she used a theory of request proposed by Trosborg (1994) as the main theory, while Oentoro used a theory of request proposed by Ervin-Tripp (1976). Moreover, Oentoro's study considered the social status as one of the social dimensions that affect the use of request strategy while the present writer's study considered the social distance between the main characters as the social dimension which may affect the use of requests spoken by the main female character in *The Proposal* movie.

Oentoro's finding gave an insight for the writer's present study. Her findings were very useful because it broadened the writer's knowledge. Solidarity or social distance was found as the factor that influences the subjects in making request. This findings inspired the writer to find out whether this social dimension can also be found in the present writer's study through the use of request strategies spoken by the main female character; Margaret Tate.

### **2.2.2 A Study of Types of Requests Used by Husbands and Wives in Malang Based on the Length of Time of Marriage (Monica, 2006)**

In her research, Monica analyzed the types of requests used by husbands and wives in Malang. She analyzed the type of requests, which are mostly used by couples who had married for about 0-5 years and couples who had married for about 25-30 years. She tried to find out the answer of two research questions namely (1) types of requests are produced by zero to five years – married husbands and wives; and twenty five to thirty years – married husbands and wives in making request and (2) types of requests are mostly produced by zero to five years – married husbands and wives; and twenty five to thirty years – married husbands and wives in making request. As the main theory, she used the theory of request proposed by Ervin-Tripp (1976).

In conducting her study, the writer used a descriptive-quantitative approach. She used descriptive approach to find the most frequently used types of requests used by husbands and wives by counting the numbers of the requests and later describe that. Besides, the study was dealing with numbers and percentages. In addition, Monica used questionnaire method to find the most frequently used types of requests used by husbands and wives in Malang.

Her findings showed that in general, husbands who had married for about 0-5 years mostly used Bald Imperatives (47,5%) to make requests to their wives, while wives who had married for about 0-5 years mostly used Embedded Imperatives (45%) to make requests to their husbands. On the other hand, in general, the writer found that husbands who had married for about 25-30 years mostly used Bald Imperatives (42,5%) to make requests to their wives, while wives who had married for about 25-30 years mostly used Permission Directives (45%) to make requests to their husbands. In short, her findings showed that both husbands who had married for 0-5 years and 25-30 years mostly used Bald Imperatives. However, there were changes in the use of requests between both wives who had married for 0-5 years and 25-30 years.

To conclude the findings, she stated that power distance gave more influence to the requests used by husbands to their wives. Although the couples had married for a period of time, the husbands tried to show his superiority while

their wives were the subordinates because husbands were usually more powerful than wives. On the contrary, wives still considered themselves as subordinates when making requests while their husbands were superior so that the wives preferred to use more softly direct request to their husbands. The result of the analysis showed that power distance had influenced the way the couples made requests while the length of time of their marriage did not contribute much influence in choosing the types of requests.

There is only one similarity and three differences between the present writer's study and Monica's study. Both studies were trying to find out the types of request mostly produced by the respondents. However, Monica's study was different from the present writer's study. First, the present writer did not use the same theory as Monica's study because she used a theory of request proposed by Trosborg (1994) as the main theory, while Monica used a theory of request proposed by Ervin-Tripp (1976). Second, the present writer used film, *The Proposal*, as the source of data while Monica's study used field research. At last, Monica's study considered three social dimensions, namely power distance, social distance and gender, while the present writer only considered one social dimension, named social distance.

Monica's study gave an insight for the writer's present study. Her findings were very useful because it broadened the writer's knowledge about the existence of different request expressions made by husbands and wives in different length of time of their marriage. In Monica's study, she concluded that power distance had influenced the way the couples make requests while the length of time of marriage did not contribute much influence in choosing the types of requests. This finding inspired the writer to find out whether other social dimensions, such as social status could influence Margaret Tate, as the present writer's subject, when giving request to her private male assistant, named Andrew Paxton, before and after the contract marriage.