

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **2.1 Literature Review**

This section covers two main concepts to support the research, consisting of speech act and speaker-hearer relations. Speech act theory is used to identify the kinds of directives in the speaker's utterances. Correspondingly, speaker-hearer relations utilizing sociolinguistic theory are used to explore the influence of hearers toward the variation of directive speech acts.

##### **2.1.1 Speech Act**

###### **2.1.1.1 Overview**

A speech act is an utterance that performs an action where the words used in an utterance are not only to convey information but also to carry out an action (Yule, 1996:47). Speech acts are classified into five categories based on the functions: assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declaration. Assertive is the type of speech act that commits the speaker to something being true or to the validity of the uttered statement (Searle, 1979:12). Directive is the type of speech act that attempts to persuade the hearer to do something (Searle, 1979:13). Commissive is the type of speech act that commits the speaker to future action (Searle, 1979:14). Expressive is the type of speech act that expresses the psychological state of the speaker (Searle, 1979:15). Declaration is the type of

speech act that changes the status or condition of the referred object (Searle, 1979:16).

Concurrently, speech acts are also classified based on the relationship between the structural forms and their functions into direct and indirect speech acts (Yule, 1996:54). The direct speech acts establish a direct relationship between a structure of utterance and its function, i.e. the declarative form functions to make a statement, the interrogative form functions to make a question, and the imperative form functions to make a command or request (Yule, 1996:55). The indirect speech acts establish an indirect relationship between a structure of utterance and its function, i.e. an interrogative form that is used to make a request instead of a question (Yule, 1996:55).

The declarative forms are characterized by the presence of the subject to precede the verb (Greenbaum & Quirk, 1990:231). The interrogative forms are marked in many ways based on the types of questions (tag question, yes-no question, *wh*-question, alternative question, etc.), and when spoken, they usually have a rising intonation at the end, which helps to indicate that a question is being asked, except alternative question or choice question which have a rise-fall intonation to stress for each choice (Greenbaum & Quirk, 1990:232-241). The imperative forms generally have a verb in the base form and have no subject, while the omitted subject implies the second person 'you' or whomever the speaker is talking to (Greenbaum & Quirk, 1990:242).

To identify what kind of speech acts in the speaker's utterance, the Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) is the most obvious device to be used by identifying the performative verb, word order, stress, and intonation that the speaker uses (Yule, 1996:49). Furthermore, how an utterance is construed as carrying out a specific speech act is also determined by the circumstances surrounding it. The appropriate circumstances for the utterance of a speech act to be recognized as intended are called the felicity conditions (Yule,1996:50). Felicity conditions that make the felicitous performance of an act become a set of rules for indicating the IFID (Searle, 1969:54). Each kind of speech acts has its characteristic of these conditions (Searle,1969:70).

Felicity conditions consist of four conditions: propositional content which refers to the meaning and content of performative utterances; preparatory condition that involves the appropriate circumstance in which performative utterance should be utter; sincerity condition that refers to the psychological stages such as intentions, thoughts, and feeling of the participant; and essential condition which refers to the commitment of speaker to undertake the actions expressed by the performative utterances (Searle, 1980:321-323).

#### **2.1.1.2 Directive Speech Act**

Directive speech acts have been discussed by a number of scholars, such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969, 1979), and Ervin Tripp (1980). However, this research here adopts Searle's scheme because it presents a clear classification of

directive speech acts based on the principle of distinction, which makes it easier to identify and understand the differences between each type of directive speech act. The principles come from the context of directive speech acts described through different felicity conditions for each type. Searle's theory is more comprehensive and detailed regarding felicity conditions, emphasizing the psychological interpretation of speech acts based on beliefs or intentions, which helps in analyzing and understanding the illocutionary force of directive speech acts.

Directive speech acts include command, ask, forbid, request, advise, challenge, dare, defy, beg, plead, pray, entreat, invite, and permit (Searle, 1979:13). The following explains each type of directive speech act.

#### **2.1.1.2.1 Command**

Searle and Vanderveken (1985:201) define commanding as the act of giving an order by the speaker to the hearer in virtue of the speaker's authority. According to Searle (1969:66), this directive does not have pragmatic condition requiring non-obviousness because its utterance is in virtue of the authority of the speaker over the hearer, so the hearer obviously will do the action.

Additionally, Cook (1989:36) proposes the felicity condition for command as described in the following: the propositional content is the future act of the hearer; the preparatory conditions are that the speaker has the authority to tell the hearer to do the action, the hearer has the obligation to do the action, the hearer has the ability to do the action, and the speaker believes the action should be done;

the sincerity condition is that the speaker wants the hearer to do the action; the essential condition is that the utterance counts as an attempt to get the hearer to do the action.

#### **2.1.1.2.2 Ask**

Searle and Vanderveken (1985:199) define asking as the act of asking a question. Furthermore, Searle (1969:66) proposes the felicity condition for the question as described in the following: the propositional content is any proposition or propositional function; the preparatory conditions are that the speaker does not know the answer if the proposition is true, or the speaker does not know the information needed to complete the proposition truly, and it is not obvious to both speaker and hearer that hearer will provide the information at that time without being asked; the sincerity condition is that the speaker wants the intended information; the essential condition is that the utterance counts as an attempt to obtain the information from the hearer.

#### **2.1.1.2.3 Forbid**

Searle and Vanderveken (1985:202) define forbidding as the propositional negation of command, which is the act of giving an order to the hearer not to do something. In line with Searle (1979:11), who mentions that ‘forbid’ belongs with ‘command’ as well as ‘challenge’, this directive also requires the point that the speaker invokes a position of force or power over the hearer, so the hearer has the obligation to not do the forbidden action. This statement is also supported by Bach

and Harnish (1979:47), who argue that its utterance is due to the speaker's authority over the hearer.

Although the rules of felicity conditions for forbid are not explicitly described, since it is a negative proposition of command, its felicity conditions adopt from felicity conditions for order by Cook (1989:36) as described in the following: the propositional content is the future act of the hearer; the preparatory conditions are that the speaker has the authority to tell the hearer not to do the action, the hearer has the obligation not to do the action, and the speaker believes the action should be stopped or prevented; the sincerity condition is that the speaker wants the hearer not to do the action; the essential condition is that the utterance counts as an attempt to get the hearer not to do the action.

#### **2.1.1.2.4 Request**

Searle and Vanderveken (1985:199) define requesting as the act of asking something politely. Contrasting with the directive speech acts that their utterance in virtue of the authority of the speaker over the hearer which causes the hearer should do the action, Searle and Vanderveken (1985:199) argue that the decision doing the action in this directive is left to the listeners, which it allows for the possibility of refusal.

Furthermore, Searle (1969:66) also proposes the felicity condition for request as described in the following: the propositional content is the future act of the hearer; the preparatory conditions are that the hearer can do the action, the speaker believes the hearer has the ability to do the action, and it is not obvious to

both speaker and hearer that hearer will do the action in the ordinary course of events of his own accord; the sincerity condition is that the speaker wants the hearer to do the action; the essential condition is that the utterance counts as an attempt to get the hearer to do the action.

#### **2.1.1.2.5 Advise**

Searle and Vanderveken (1985:203) define advising as the act of telling something the hearer should do which is in the hearer's interest. According to Searle (1969:67) the decision to do an action is left to the listeners since this directive is more like telling the hearers what is the best for them.

Searle (1969:67) also proposes the felicity condition for advice as described in the following: the propositional content is the future act of the hearer; the preparatory conditions are that the hearer has some reason to believe that the action will benefit the hearer, and it is not obvious to both the speaker and the hearer that the hearer will do the action in the ordinary course of events; the sincerity condition is that the speaker believes the action will benefit the hearer; and the essential condition is that the utterance counts as an undertaking to the effect that the action is in the hearer's best interest.

#### **2.1.1.2.6 Challenge**

Hornby (2005:242) defines challenge as ordering someone to do something dangerous or difficult to test someone's ability. Since Searle (1979:11) states that the 'challenge' directive belongs with 'command' and 'forbid', it does not have the pragmatic condition requiring non-obviousness because as well as

command, its utterance is also in virtue of the authority of speaker over hearer. Therefore, the hearer will obviously do the action.

Although the rules of felicity conditions for challenge are not explicitly defined, since it belongs with ‘command’, its felicity conditions adopt from felicity conditions for order by Cook (1989:36) as described in the following: the propositional content is the future act of the hearer; the preparatory conditions are that the speaker has the authority to tell the hearer to do the action, the hearer has the obligation to do the action, the hearer can do the action, and the speaker believes the action should be done; the sincerity condition is that the speaker wants to test the hearer's abilities; the essential condition is that the utterance counts as an attempt to get the hearer to do the action.

#### **2.1.1.2.7 Warn**

Searle and Vanderveken (1985:203) define warning as the act of getting the hearer to avoid something not in the hearer’s interest. According to Searle (1969:67), the decision to do an action is left to the listeners since this directive is more like telling the hearers if they do not do *X*, then *Y* will occur.

Furthermore, Searle (1969:67) also proposes the felicity condition for warning as described in the following: the propositional content is the future event or state; the preparatory conditions are that the hearer has reason to believe that the event is not in the hearer’s interest, and it is not obvious to both the speaker and the hearer that the event will occur; the sincerity condition is that the speaker believes that the event is not in the hearer’s best interest; the essential condition is

that the utterance counts as an undertaking to the effect that the event is not in the hearer's best interest.

## **2.1.2 Speaker and Hearer**

### **2.1.2.1 Number of Hearers**

According to Hymes in Bell (2014:136), the hearers or audience are people who hear the speech from the speakers. Bell (2014:140) further classifies the hearers into several roles in the Audience Design framework consisting of: the *addressees* as the main audience role who are known, ratified, and addressed; *auditors* as the third person who may be ratified but are not directly addressed; *overhearers* as the third person who are not ratified participants in the conversation, but their presence is known by the speaker; and *eavesdropper* as the parties whose presence is unknown to the speaker.

These audience roles influence how the speakers design their utterances (Bell, 2014:141). The implication scale of audience members on a speaker's style design is based on role distance, in which speakers choose their style depending on who their specific addressee is. At the same time, the auditors have a more significant effect on a speaker's style rather than the overhearers. In contrast, the eavesdroppers, as being unknown, cannot affect a speaker's style (Bell, 1984:160).

Clark & Carlson (1982:344) argue that in a conversation involving two people, in which it is clear that only a speaker and an addressee are present, the speaker designs the utterance depending on an individual addressee as the real

target of what is being said. In contrast, in a conversation involving more than two people, the speaker designs the utterance considering their common ground, because it must be intended to be understood not only by an individual addressee but also by the other addressees and the ratified participants if they exist, so all the parties to the conversation can keep track of what the speaker said (Clark & Carlson, 1982:344). For instance, the scenario in a television interview between Crothers and Senator Smyth based on Clark & Carlson (1982:339), as shown in the following.

Before the television camera in private conversation, they may talk as the following:

Crothers : “Well, Joe, what do you think of the New Hampshire stink?”

Senator Smyth : “It's a goddam mess. If Bill doesn't watch his ass, Bert may take away all his marbles”

However, when the camera is on, Crothers and Smyth treat the unseen viewers or audiences as ratified participants, and their utterances may change as the following:

Crothers : “Senator Smyth, what do you think of Jones's controversial remarks in the New Hampshire election campaign last week?”

Senator Smyth : “They were unfortunate. If Senator Jones doesn't watch his step, Bert Appleman may get impatient with him and cut off all his campaign funds.”

Crothers : “You're speaking of Bert Appleman, the Democratic Party

National Chairman, aren't you?"

Senator Smyth : "Yes, I am."

In accommodating the ratified participants, the private references to Joe, to 'the New Hampshire stink', to Bill, to Bert, and to 'marbles' are filled out in order the television audience can understand them too. When Smyth does not fill out his references enough, as with the mention of Bert Appleman, Crothers requests clarification, even though he himself knows perfectly well who is being referred to. They move into a register appropriate for their public personae and they avoid informality and offensive expletives (Clark & Carlson, 1982:339).

Another example is when the speaker speaks to more than one person at a time, as shown in the following:

Ann, *speaking to Ben and Carl* : "How did you like the party, Ben?"

Although the addressee is Ben, Carl is also part of the conversation as the ratified-participant, so Ann intends him to understand fully too. Therefore, if she continues "And what about you Carl?", she expects Carl to be recognize what she is asking since Carl keeps track of what the speaker said (Clark, 1986:518).

Additionally, the speaker needs to get the hearers to realize their roles, so that they mutually recognize which hearers are designated as participants or auditors and which are designated as addressees (Clark & Carlson, 1982:346). According to Clark & Carlson 1982:346, the significant devices to get the hearers to realize their roles are the physical arrangement (the hearers in the same group as the speaker generally assume that they are intended to be participants, whereas

other hearers cannot.), conversational history (the hearers can assume as participants for the current utterance if they were participants during the last utterance), gestures (the addressee can be picked out by eye contact, a hand gesture or nod of the head, while certain hearers can be excluded as addressees or participants by the speaker's turning his back on them), manner of speaking (a speaker can select a small group of people as participants or addressees, letting everyone else know they are not participants by whispering, while a speaker can do the opposite by speaking in a markedly loud voice), and linguistic content (addressees can be defined by vocatives and other devices, such as "Georgia, I want you to come here").

The speaker may also design the utterances based on overhearers concerning politeness (Carl & Carlson, 1982:346). In most societies, certain words are taboo to be overheard in certain circumstances, so the speaker needs to avoid these words being overheard by people around, in order to protect the speaker's public persona and to avert overhearers discomfort (Carl & Carlson, 1982:346). For example, in urban America, obscenities freely used in private rooms are often avoided in public places where they may be overheard, so the speaker will use circumlocutions such as "She's ready to go" or "The hammer's back" just to avoid saying "The gun's cocked", in order to avoid an overhearer might hear only the critical word, and mistake it for an obscenity (Carl & Carlson, 1982:346).

At the same time, the speaker can also prevent overhearers from recognizing what the speaker is saying by using a spy code strategy, in which the speaker expresses hints or switches to a language unknown to them, for example, there is the secrets-in-a-crowd scenario on a bus as shown in the following:

Ann : “Barbara, do you remember that thing about you know who that we were talking about last week? Well, it happened”

Ann's references are designed to be opaque to bus passengers, but Barbara, who is the only one for whom the last week's conversation, is understand the hint of “who” (Clark & Carlson, 1982:345)

### 2.1.2.2 Social Dimensions

Directive speech acts that persuade the hearer to do things force vary in strength (Holmes, 2013:277). When a directive is uttered through an imperative form, it carries greater illocutionary force and puts the hearer under greater obligation to do the action (Donohue & Diez, 1985:307). Correspondingly, Holmes (2013:277) states that when a directive uses an interrogative or declarative form, it carries lower illocutionary force that is counted as a polite attempt to avoid offense, as shown in the following examples:

“Sit down”	(Imperative)
“You sit down”	( <i>You</i> Imperative)
“Sit down will you?”	(Interrogative with tag)
“Won’t you sit down?”	(Interrogative with negative modal)
“I’d like you to sit down”	(Declarative)
“You’d be more comfortable sitting	(Declarative)

down”

The speaker’s choice of the appropriate form of a directive is influenced by social factors consisting of the social distance between the speaker and the hearer and their social status, which are classified as social dimensions by Holmes (2013:279).

According to Holmes (2013:10), social status refers to the hierarchy, power dynamics, or authority, which are determined by occupation, education, economy, etc. In the directive, imperative tends to be used by superiors to subordinates where status differences are clearly marked and accepted, for instance, between teachers and students in the example utterance “Open your book at page 32” (Holmes, 2013:279). However, Holmes (2013:279) also argues that in a role relationship between a teacher and students, a teacher can also use minimally explicit forms or hints that still will be interpreted accurately as command directives, since they consider everything their teacher said as a possible directive, for example, “Blackboard” means “Clean the blackboard”.

At the same time, social distance is concerned with solidarity, which how well the speaker and the hearer know each other (Holmes, 2013:9). The degree of social distance is determined by age, gender, social roles, whether they work together, or are part of the same family, etc (Holmes, 2013:240). In the directive, imperative is more used between those who are intimate, such as close friends or family, for example: “Wash your hands for dinner, children”. (Holmes, 2013:279). In contrast, interrogatives and declaratives, including hints, tend to be used

between those who are socially distant (Holmes 2013:277). The following examples are according to Holmes (2013:288):

Post Office delivery man *to customer* : “Can I have your signature?”  
 Director *to colleague* : “I think it’s time you let someone else contribute.”

## **2.2 Methodology**

This section covers the data sources and the steps of how the data is obtained and analyzed.

### **2.2.1 Data, Population, and Sample**

The data is taken from the script of the movie “Whiplash” (2014) by Damien Chazelle. This research focuses on all utterances performed by Fletcher as the population. The sample is Fletcher’s directive utterances towards all characters by marking the selected utterances as the sampling technique, which is counted as a purposive sampling technique. The selected utterances consist of the directive utterances by Fletcher that will be categorized based on the types of directive speech acts by Searle (1979:13), and the relationship between the structural forms and their functions by Yule (1996:54).

### **2.2.2 Method of Collecting Data**

The data is collected using a non-participant observation and documentation method, as described in the following steps.

- a. Watching the movie “Whiplash” (2014) by Damien Chazelle.
- b. Downloading the script of the film in the srt format via *subscene* and convert into document format.
- c. Checking the script’s accuracy by reading the script while re-watching the movie.
- d. Transferring the data, which is all utterances, into *google sheets* with the following column headers: “No” column provides a sequential number to identify the utterance; “Speaker” column provides the name or identifier of the character speaking; “Hearer (A)” column provides the name or identifier of the character being addressed; “Hearer (P)” column provides the name or identifier of the character being the auditor or ratified participant; “Hearer (O)” column provides the name or identifier of the character being the overhearer; “Kind of Directive” column provides the type of directive speech act; “Direct/indirect” column provides the information whether the utterance includes as direct or indirect speech act; “KWIC” column contains the keyword in context, which is the specific word, phrase, or clauses, from the utterance that is relevant to the analysis; and “Right” and “Left” columns contain additional words or context around the keyword of the utterance. However, in this step, I only input data for “Speaker”, “Hearer”, and “KWIC”, while the rest of columns will be filled later, as shown in the following picture.

1	No	Speaker	Hearer (A)	Hearer (P)	Hearer (O)	Kind of Directive	Direct/Indirect	Left	KWIC	Right
49		Fletcher	andrew	students	kramer			Behind,	same thing	
50		Fletcher	bassits	students	kramer			Bass,	five bars of Donna Lee	
51		Fletcher	andrew	students	kramer			Alright,	Drums, with me	
52		Fletcher	kramer						Thank you, Joe	
53		Fletcher	ryan						No, no, no. Other drums	
54		Fletcher	andrew						Room B-16 tomorrow morning, 6:00 a.m.	
55		Fletcher	andrew						Don't be late	
56		Kramer	students					Alright, everybody	From the top	A-one, two, three, unh...
57		Carl	andrew						You the new alternate?	
58		Andrew	carl						Yeah, I'm Andrew Neiman.	
59		Carl	andrew						Tune the set to B-flat, then turn my pages.	
60		Andrew	carl						Sure	
61		Andrew	pianist						Excuse me. Um, could I get a B-flat? Thank you.	
62		Andrew	pianist						Sorry. Can you...? Just one more time?	
63		Andrew	carl						That's a great kit. I play the new cymbals now	
64		Saxophonist	students						Milk the cunt!	
65		Fletcher	students					We got a squeaker	Isn't he cute?	
66		Fletcher	students					Alright, gang.	Whiplash	
67		Carl	andrew						Page, Page!	
68		Fletcher	barker	students				Barker, that is not v	Do not come early	

Figure 1. The Template for Collecting Data

- e. Creating a *filter view* that can be used to find the selected data.
- f. Starting to identify the directive speech acts by: filtering the data that only presents Fletcher's utterances, in which I click on the funnel icon beside the "Speaker" column, and selects "Fletcher" in the dropdown menu; entering the "Kind of Directives" and "Direct/Indirect" columns by identifying the type of directive speech act, and the directness or indirectness of each utterances; and entering "KWIC" column by determining the parts of the utterance that will be analyzed, if all lines of the utterance are not a directive, as shown in the following picture.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	No	Speaker	Hearer (A)	Hearer (P)	Hearer (O)	Kinds of Directives	Direct / Indirect	Left	KWIC	Right
49		Fletcher	andrew	students	kramer	Command	I	Behind,	same thing	
50		Fletcher	bassits	students	kramer	Command	I	Bass,	five bars of Donna Lee	
51		Fletcher	andrew	students	kramer	Command	I	Alright,	Drums, with me	
54		Fletcher	andrew			Command	I		Room B-16 tomorrow morning, 6:00 a.m.	
55		Fletcher	andrew			Forbid	D		Don't be late	
65		Fletcher	students			Ask	D	We got a squeaker t	Isn't he cute?	
66		Fletcher	students			Command	I	Alright, gang,	Whiplash	
68		Fletcher	barker	students		Forbid	D	Barker, that is not y	Do not come early	
69		Fletcher	students			Command	I		Bar 93	Five, six, and...
70		Fletcher	students			Command	D		Stop	
74		Fletcher	students			Request	I	We have an out-of-t	would that player care to identify himself?	
72		Fletcher	students			Ask	D		No?	Okay, maybe a bug flew ir
73		Fletcher	students			Command	I		One-fifteen	Five, six, and...
75		Fletcher	saxophonist	students		Command	I		Reeds	Five, six, and...
76		Fletcher	trumpets	students		Command	I		Bones	Five, six, and...
77		Fletcher	elmer	students		Command	D	He's here.	Tell me it's not you,	Elmer Fudd
78		Fletcher	elmer	students		Command	D	It's okay.	Play	
79		Fletcher	elmer	students		Ask	D		Do you think you're out of tune?	

Figure 2. Identifying Directive Speech Acts

- g. Entering the data number of the directive speech acts performed by Fletcher in the “No” column by using the *filter view feature* to present the directive speech acts that will be analyzed further.

### 2.2.3 Method of Analyzing Data

This research employs both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative method is applied to show the frequency of each directive speech act performed by Fletcher to identify the dominant type that can be used to analyze the hearer's influence toward his variation of directives. Correspondingly, the descriptive qualitative method is employed to analyze the data and describe the finding. The steps for analyzing data are described in the following.

- a. Identifying the frequency and percentage of each type of directive speech act performed by Fletcher using *filter view feature* in *google sheets*.

click the funnel icon and select "Command" in the dropdown menu

No	Speaker	Hearer (A)	Hearer (P)	Hearer (O)	Kinds of Directives	Direct / Indirect	Left	KWIC	Right
2	Fletcher	andrew			Command	D		Stay	
10	Fletcher	andrew			Command	D		Show me your rudiments	
11	Fletcher	andrew			Command	D		Double-time swing	
13	Fletcher	andrew			Command	D		double-time	
14	Fletcher	andrew			Command	D		Double it	
15	Fletcher	andrew			Command	D		Faster	
16	Fletcher	andrew			Command	D		Faster	
18	Fletcher	students		kramer	Command	D		Down the line	
19	Fletcher	trumpets	students	kramer	Command	I	Trumpets	bars seven and eight	Three, four.
20	Fletcher	trombone	students	kramer	Command	I	Okay, Alright	Bar 24, the end of two	
21	Fletcher	saxophonist	students	kramer	Command	D	Tenor,	let's start the pickup to 11	Three, four.
22	Fletcher	saxophonist	students	kramer	Command	I	You're in the fir	Let's see if it's because you're cute	Three, four.
23	Fletcher	ryan	students	kramer	Command	D	Drums,	Let's hear a little double-time swing	
24	Fletcher	andrew	students	kramer	Command	I	Behind,	same thing	
25	Fletcher	bassits	students	kramer	Command	I	Bass,	five bars of Donna Lee	
26	Fletcher	andrew	students	kramer	Command	I	Alright,	Drums, with me	
27	Fletcher	andrew			Command	I		Room B-16 tomorrow morning, 6:00 a.m.	
30	Fletcher	students			Command	I	Alright,	Whistle	

frequency 115 of 417 rows displayed

Figure 3. Filter View Feature to Find the Commanding Frequency

- b. Analyzing the type of directive speech act by describing the directness or indirectness and the fulfillment of felicity condition of directives as Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) considering the utterance's context.
- c. Creating the frequency of the directive speech acts based on hearers, using *filter view feature in google sheets* to find out the influence of hearers toward the directive speech act variations.
- d. Analyzing and describing the influence of hearers separated into two categories (number of hearers and speaker-hearer hierarchies) by considering the frequency of directives and the background of the hearer.