CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Related of the theories

In this chapter the writer wants to explain what theory that is used to accomplish this study. The main data in this analysis is the drama Waiting for godot and it can be supported by some resources. The theory of discourse analysis by George Yule's *Discourse Analysis, An Introduction to Discourse Analysis by* Malcolm Coulthard will help the writer to analyze this study and the theory of illocutionary acts by Searle will also support this analysis. Some books with other theories will be also used by the writer to finish his thesis.

2.1.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of how to use language in communication. Pragmatics is also one of the fields in linguistics that studies about meaning. The meaning studied in pragmatics is influenced by contexts. This is in line with Brown and Yule (1983:2) who state that pragmatics is the discussion of linguistics that involves the considerations of contexts. In other words, it can be said that, in pragmatics, the meaning of a particular expression is various depending on its context.

Pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by speaker (or writer) and interpret by a listener (or reader). It has consequently,

mean by their utterances that what the words by them selves. pragmatics is study of speaker meaning. Brown and yule (1996:3)

Different theorists have focused on different properties of utterances. To discuss them it will be helpful to make a distinction between 'near side pragmatics and 'far side pragmatics'. The utterances philosophers usually take as paradigmatic are assertive uses of declarative sentences, where the speaker says something. Near-side pragmatics is concerned with the nature of certain facts that are relevant to determining what is said. Far-side pragmatics is focused on what happens beyond saying: what speech acts are performed in or by saying what is said, or what implicatures are generated by saying what is said.

Pragmatics in this study is included into facts about speaker's intention in uttering a speech act. Speech act is an actions performed via utterances. There will be theories which will be discussed about it.

2.1.2 Speech act

Speech act theory states that the action performed when an utterance is produced can be analyzed in three levels; they are locutionary act, illocutionary force, and perlocutionary effect (Cutting, 2002:30). It is different with Austin's opinion which says that there are kinds of speech act, they are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Actually their theory has the same meaning but they mention it in the different terms. Yule, (1996:47) also gives the definition about speech act which says that it is the actions performed via utterances. His theory has the same meaning with the theories which are stated

before but he adds that in English, speech act given more specific labels such as apology, compliment, and etc.

2.1.3 Types of Speech Acts

Austin suggests that when people are saying something they perform three kinds of acts which are locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act (Levinson 1983: 236)

- Locutionary Act

Locutionary act is semantic or literal meaning of asentence. Austin said that the interpretation of locutionary act is concerned with meaning. In other words, a locutionary act is an act of producing a meaningful linguistic expression. Briefly, locutionary act is the meaning of what a speaker says. For example: if someone says 'Switch on the lamp!' the locutionary act is the speaker wants someone to switch the lamp on.

- Perlocutionary Act

Perlocutionary act is the expected effect on the hearer by uttering the sentence. In uttering a sentence or an utterance the speaker expects that the hearer will achieve an effect. For example: If someone says "Where's your necklace?" it may causes you touch your neck quickly or you might respond 'Oh, I put it in the drawer'.

- Illocutionary Act

Illocutionary act is the act of saying, which is committed with the intends of speaker by uttering a sentence such as asking, stating, questioning, promising, ordering, apologizing, threatening, and requesting. According to Austin's preliminary informal description, the idea of an "illocutionary act" can be captured by emphasizing that "by saying something, we do something", as when a minister joins two people in marriage saying, "I now pronounce you husband and wife." (Austin would eventually define the "illocutionary act" in a more exact manner.) Illocutionary act is a technical term introduced by John L. Austin in investigations concerning what he calls 'performative' and 'constative utterances'. According to Austin's original exposition in How to Do Things With Words, an illocutionary act is an act (1) for the performance of which I must make it clear to some other person that the act is performed (Austin speaks of the 'securing of uptake'), and (2) the performance of which involves the production of what Austin calls 'conventional consequences' as, e.g., rights, commitments, or obligations. For example, in order to successfully perform a promise I must make clear to my audience that the promise occurs, and undertake an obligation to do the promised thing: hence promising is an illocutionary act in the present sense. However, for certain reasons, among them insufficient knowledge of Austin's original exposition, the term illocutionary act is nowadays understood in a number of other ways. Many define the term with reference to examples, saying such things as that any speech act like stating, asking, commanding, promising, and so on is an illocutionary act; they then often fail to give anysense of the expression

illocutionary act capable of making clear what being an illocutionary act essentially consists in. It is also often emphasized that Austin introduced the illocutionary act by means of a contrast with other kinds of acts: the illocutionary act, he says, is an act performed in saying something, as contrasted with a locutionary act, the act of saying something, and also contrasted with a perlocutionary act, an act performed by saying something. But it may be misleading to distinguish between kinds of acts, for these are not separate categories of speech, but instead describe different levels on which speech might work. Any one particular speech event may have any combination of locutionary, illocutionary or perlocutionary effects. Still another conception of an illocutionary act goes backto Schiffer's famous book 'Meaning' (1972, 103), in which the illocutionary act is represented as just the act of meaning something. According to the conception Bach and Harnish adopt in 'Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts' (1979: 89), an illocutionary act is an attempt to communicate, which they again analyze as the expressing of an attitude. According to Searle (1969:34),the illocutionary act is an act performed in saying something. On other words, illocutionary act can be defined as using a sentence to perform a function. When a speaker says something, he or she may perform some functions of act through the utterances such as request,complain, etc.

2.1.4 Types of Illocutionary Acts

According to Austin and Searle. Austin differs the kind of speech act in three kinds, while Searle differs it into five kinds of speech act. Austin divides the kinds of speech act into locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act.

In other sides, Searle divides the kind of speech acts into comissives, directives, assertive, expressives, and declarations (Searle, 1979).

- Comissives are those illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker (again in varying degrees) to some future course of action. It seems like assertives class. Verbs denoting members of this class are asking, ordering, commanding, requesting, begging, pleading, praying, entreating, and also inviting, permitting, and advising (Searle, 1979: 13).

- Directives refer to the attempts made by the speaker to get the addressee to do something. Verbs denoting members of this class are ask, order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat, and also invite, permit, and advise (Searle, 1979: 14).

- The point or purpose of the members of the assertive class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition (Searle, 1979: 13). In other words, assertives is the utterance by the speaker to commit in doing something. The examples of assertives are concluding, deducing, and complaining.

- Expressives is the next class of illocutionary acts proposed by Searle. The illocutionary point of this class is to express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content (Searle, 1979: 15). In short, expressives is the acts which reveal expression in the

utterances. Thanking, congratulating, apologizing, condoling, deploring, and welcoming are the examples of expressives.

- Declarations are the acts containing utterances that are intended to alter the world. Including in this group are 'defining', 'abbreviating', 'naming' 'calling' or 'christening'.

2.1.5 The Function of Illocutionary Acts

In speech acts investigation, the illocutionary act is the main focus of the discussion because illocutionary act is the intended meaning of utterance. Therefore, the illocutionary act always has function of speech acts. Leech (1991:104) states that at most general level; illocutionary functions may be classified into the following four functions as follow:

- Competitive: This illocutionary act aims to the social goal. For instance: ordering, asking, and demanding. In this function, the negative politeness is used to reduce the unpleasant way between what the speakers want to the politeness should say.

- Convivial: This illocutionary act aims incompliant with the social purposes, such as offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, and congratulating. In this context, the politeness is utilized positively to make a pleasure relationship to the society.

- Collaborative: This illocutionary act aims at ignoring the social purposes, such as asserting, reporting, and instructing. This function does not contain politeness.

- Conflictive: This illocutionary act aims against the social purposes, for instance threatening, accusing, refusing, and reprimanding. It against politeness that is not at all since it is purposed the anger except in the irony sentence.

We can conclude that assertives belong to collaborative category, directives belong to the competitive category, commissives tend to be convivial or competitive, and expressives also tend to be convivial. All of them depend on the context.

2.2 Related Studies

To enlarge our knowledge about linguistics, the writer reviews the previous study who conducted a research on the same topic about speech acts. The first is juli simanjuntak, the student of university of Sumatra utara medan (2009) *An analysis of speech act in charles dicken's A Tale of to cities: pragmantic analysis.* In this thesis, the researcher found on the speech act which are used by those two characters. Differences between the writer research and july research on the object and the theory used. The writer used Searle's theory of illocutionary acts and juli's research used language acquisition theory.

The second is Phyllis Koryoo Kaburise, the student of university of petoria (2005) *speech act theory and communication: A univen study.* In this thesis the researcher focused on his investigation the communicative competence a group of second language speakers. The study employed speect act theory, a discourse evaluation method within the cross-cultural paradigm, to ascertain the structural (form) and the pragmatic (function) statuses of selected in the univen. The differences between the writer and Phyllis's research on the objects and findings. The writer found the five types of illocutionary acts in *Waiting for godot drama* (assertive, directive commissive, expressive and declarative). Directive is mostly performed in the form of commanding. And this research also discusses about the functions of illocutionary acts.

The third is Dyah Anita D the student of Diponegoro university semarang (2009) *The speech act and communication strategi in children of 3-5 years old* in Dyah's thesis she focused on strategi communication using speech act in children 3-5 years old. Differences between the writer research and Dyah's research on the object. The writer used Waiting for godot as a object but in the Dyah's thesis used children 3-5 years old as a object.

This research investigates illocutionary acts in dialogue of Vladimir and Estragon in "*waiting for godot*". To analyze the data, illocutionary acts theory proposed by Searle: assertive*,* directive*,* commissive*,* expressive, and declaratives is used. The main difference of this study from previous is the different objects that the researchers investigated and its focus in study Vladimir and Estragon dialogue.