CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this study, there are some theories related with the field. The theories are explained in this chapter. There are sub topics such as pragmatics, speech act, types of illocutionary act, and context of situation. There are also some previous studies that related with the study.

2.1 Pragmatics

Yule (1996) defined pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker or writer and interpreted by a listener or reader. It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis what the people mean by their utterances than what the words and phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. It requires a consideration of how the speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with whom they are talking to, when, where, and under what circumstances (Yule, 1996: 8).

Pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. It assumes that when people communicate with each other they normally follow some kind of co-operative principle; that is, they have a shared understanding of how they should co-operate in their communications (Paltridge, 2006: 53).

This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what they said. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meaning, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of actions, for example requests that they are performing when they speak (Yule, 1996: 4).

2.2 Speech Acts

Austin (1962: 108) defined speech acts as the action performed in saying something. Yule (1996: 47) defined utterances that perform an action are generally called as speech act. Then, Mey (1994: 111) viewed that speech act are actions happening in the world.

Definitions about speech act above, almost same for those researchers. Whatever the definitions of speech act, briefly speech act is an act when people say a word and theoretically, it is the productions of the utterance in the aim of making things happen. Traugott & Pratt (1980) assumed speech act theory contributes to the theory of linguistic universals in formulating the necessary and universal laws governing the successful performance and satisfaction of all kinds of illocutionary acts in language use and comprehension (Traugott & Pratt, 1980: 231).

Besides, Austin (1962) also mentioned that speech act theory can be analyzed on three levels. These are, locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. The definitions about three basic levels of speech act are described below:

2.2.1 Locutionary Act

The locutionary act refers to the literal meaning of the actual words, for instance, *it's hot in here* referring to the temperature

(Paltridge, 2006: 55). Locutionary is the act of saying, the literal meaning of the utterances. Locution is the description about what the speakers said. Peccei (1999:4) assumed that locution is the actual form of words used by the speakers. On the other word, speaker produces a meaningful linguistic expression.

2.2.2 Illocutionary Act

The illocutionary act refers to the speaker's intention in uttering the words (Paltridge, 2006: 55). According to Peccei (1999) Illocution is what the speaker is doing by uttering these words: commanding, offering, promising, threatening, thankingand others (1999:44). It means, in every utterance that the speaker produced it is also another act that performed inside the utterance.

Yule (1996) assumed the illocutionary act is performed via the communicative force on an utterance (1996: 48). Mostly people do not just produce well-formed utterances with no purpose; they form an utterance with some kind function in mind (Yule, 1996: 48). In the writer's opinion, illocutionary act is the speaker's intention toward the utterance he or she says. Speech act theory brings illocution to the fore by situating language within the relationships by it users (Petrey, 1995:13).

Searle & Vanderveken (1985) stated the minimal units of human communication are speech acts of a type called illocutionary acts. Some examples of these are statements, questions, commands, promises, and apologies (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985: 1). Illocutionary act is the function of the word, the specific purpose that the speakers have in mind. The most important study of the three kinds of speech act is illocutionary acts. It is because the illocutionary acts becomes the basic of analysis.

2.2.3 Perlocutionary Act

The perlocutionary act refers to the effect of the utterance has on the thoughts or actions of the other person (Paltridge, 2006: 55). It is the consequent effect of the utterance on the hearer through the uttering of linguistic expression, or the overall aim of the utterance (Peccei, 1999:44). It may or may not be what the speaker wants but it is caused by the locution. In my assumption, perlocutionary act is the hearer's interpretation towards the speaker's utterance.

2.3 Types of Illocutionary Acts

Searle (1977) takes the exception to Austin's original classification into verdictive, expositive, exercitive, behavities, and commissive acts (as cited in Wardhani, 2012).

- a. Verdictives are typified by giving of a verdict, as the name implies,by a jury, arbitrator, or umpire. But they need not be final; theymay be, for an example, an estimate, reckoning, or appraisal.
- Exercitives are the exercising of powers, rights or influence.
 Examples are appointing, voting, ordering, urging, advising, warning, and others.

- c. Commissives are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking, they commit you to do something, but include also declarations or announcements of intention.
- d. Behavities are a very miscellaneous group, and have to do with attitudes and social behavior. Examples are apologizing, congratulating, commending, condoling, cursing, and challenging.
- e. Expositives is the plan how our utterances fit into the course of an argument or conversation, how we are using words, or in general are expository. Examples are 'I reply', 'I argue', 'I concede', 'I illustrate', 'I assume', 'I postulate'.

Among other things, Searle criticize Austin for operating with overlapping criteria, for categories that do not satisfy the definition of the category. The five types of illocutionary act delivered by Searle are further explained below:

2.3.1 Assertives

Searle (in Leech 1983) defined assertives commit speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, this category performs action such as: stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming, and reporting (1983: 105). In other words, it tells about the truthfully of the utterance or represents reality by making their utterance or words fit with the world as they believe it to be. For example: "*no one can makes a better cake than me*", this utterance is assertives that boasting about himself and disparage others. Other example is "*it*'s *raining*", this utterance is stating the general truth.

2.3.2 Directives

Searle (in Leech 1983) also defined directives are intended to produce some effect through action by the hearer, such as; ordering, commanding, requesting, and advising (1983: 106). This category means that speakers direct the hearer to perform particular act which will make the world fit with the speaker's words. In the writer's assumption, the utterance in this category attempt to make the addressee perform an action. For example, "*clean it up*!". It means that Ed commanding Fey to clean the mess.

2.3.3 Commissives

Commissives commit speaker to some future action, for example; promising, refusing, planning, vowing, and offering (Searle in Leech, 1983: 106). In commissives, speakers commit themselves to a future act which will make the world fit their words. For example: "*I'll take her to the doctor*" it is the example of planning. The situation is Steve's cat named Coco is sick, and he will take Coco to the vet to check it.

2.3.4 Expressives

Expressives have the function of speaker's expressing, 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). The classifications of expressive are thanking, apologizing, congratulating, praising, welcoming, condoling, and others (Searle in Leech, 1983: 106). In the writer's opinion, expressive is kinds of speech act that express the feeling. *"I'm sorry"* is the example of apologizing in expressive types. It reflects that the speaker require apologizing to hearer.

2.3.5 Declarations

Searle (in Leech 1983) defined Declarations are illocution whose successful performance brings about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality, such as resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, excommunicating, appointing, sentencing, and others (1983: 106). This category was special because it can change something in reality. For example utterance: "*I pronounce you husband and wife*". This utterance by a priest to declares a man and a women marriage and become a husband and wife.

2.4 Context of Situation

Context is background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer and which contributes to hearer's interpretation of what speaker means by given utterance (Leech, 1983: 13). Cutting (in Paltridge 2006) explained the background knowledge context in terms of what people 'know about each other and the world' and also in terms of what people 'know about what they have been saying' (2006: 54). Hymes (1964) in Brown and Yule (1983) views the role of contexts in interpretation, on the other, as supporting the intended interpretation (1983: 37). He sets about specifying the features of context which may be relevant to the identification of a type of speech event (Brown & Yule, 1983: 38).

Hymes (1964) abstracts the roles about the concept of features of context in speech situation as described below:

2.4.1 Addressor and Addressee

The addressor is the speaker or writer who produces the utterance. The addressee is the hearer or reader who is the recipient of the utterance. In other words, the addressor and addressee could be said as the participants of the utterance. The addressor is someone who gives information and, addressee receives the information.

2.4.2 Audience

Audience is also one of the participants, since the presence of overhears may contribute to the specification of the speech event.

2.4.3 Topic

Based on Hymes' category, topic is what being talking about.

2.4.4 Setting

Setting refers in terms of where the event is situated in place and time.

2.4.5 Channel

Channel refers to contact between the participants is in the event being maintained by speech, writing, signing, and others.

2.4.6 Code

Code refers to the choice of what language, or dialect, or style of language is being used.

2.4.7 Message-Form

Message-form refers to what form is intended by the participant, for instance chat, debate, sermon, conversation and others.

2.4.8 Key and Purpose

The key of an utterance or speech event is determined by cues. Every speaker has different way to utter words. Then, purpose refers to what did the participants intend should come about as a result of the communicative event.

2.5 Previous Studies

To expand knowledge about linguistics, the writer reveals some previous studies, which are contains any correlation with this study. The first is a thesis written by Zumaroh (2012), entitle "*The Analysis of Speech Act Used in Air Force One Movie Script*". Zumarohhave researched about the types of speech acts; locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. She used a movie as an object to be analyzed. The data were taken from all of the utterances that uttered by main character of Air Force One. Zumaroh's thesis has some differences with this study. For instance; in this study, the writer wants more specific in illocutionary act. Also, about the theory, in Zumaroh's thesis used Austin's theory but in this study the writer uses theory from Searle (1979). The writer uses a novel as the subject to be analyzed. In addition, the data were taken from some utterances that uttered by the main character.

Rachmadiah (2014), with her thesis entitled "A Study of Illocutionary Acts Used by Vladimir and Estragon in Waiting ForGodot". In this thesis, she described about five types of illocutionary act based on Searle and the function of illocutionary act. She used drama as the object to be analyzed. She found 29 data in her thesis, and the data were taken from some conversations between Vladimir and Estragon in Waiting ForGodot.

A thesis conducted by Wardani (2012), entitled "An Analysis of Illocutionary Act inPrince of Persia: The Sand of Time Movie". In this thesis, she described about illocutionary act used by the main character named Dastan. There are 17 data of the result of her thesis, and the data were taken from Dastan's utterances. She used theory from Searle to reveal five types of illocutionary acts. On the other hand, she explained the context when the illocution uttered by Dastan by using theory from Leech (1983).