CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, the writer wants to explain about some theories which are used to accomplish this study. The main data in this analysis is *The Zoo Story* drama by Edward Albee. In this study, the writer uses a number of theories to help the writer analyzing the data. The writer decides to use Pragmatics, Speech Acts (locution, illocution, and perlocution) and Illocutionary acts also divided into Assertive, Directive, Commisive, Expressive and Declarative and the last theory that the writer used is Context.

2.1.1 Pragmatics

Linguistics as a study of language has various branches, one of it is Pragmatics. It is the branch of linguistics that studies about relationship between languages with the context. We could see the example as followed:

Mother	: How was your English test?
Bella	: I just got 50 mom.
Mother	: **That's good**. Don't ever study, just play with your friend!

The word "That's good" doesn't mean "well" or "not bad", but it has converse meaning because what mother means about Bella's English score is really bad, she gets 50. However, mother is really angry because of it, so she says "that's good". It does not mean that she truly gets good score, but mother says it in order Bella realizes that she really gets bad score. So, every speaker's utterance has intended meaning.

According to Yule (1996: 3) pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning communicated by speaker and interpreted by listener. Therefore, pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.

In many ways, pragmatics is the study of invisible meaning or how we recognize what is meant even when it is not actually said or written. In order for that, the speaker and writer must be able to depend on many shared assumption and expectation. The investigation of those assumptions and expectations provides us with some insight into how more gets communicated than said. As another example, it is taken from a newspaper advertisement, and thinks not only about what the words might mean, but also about what the advertiser intended them to mean: BABY & TODDLER SALE. In the normal meaning, we assume that this store has not gone into the business of selling children, but rather that it is advertising clothes for babies. The word *clothes* do not appear, but our normal interpretation would be that the advertiser intended us to understand his message as relating to the sale of baby clothes.

So, by the explanation above, we could know that 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 Acts

Two philosophers, John Austin and John Searle developed speech act theory from the basic belief that language is used to perform actions. Its fundamental insight focus on how meaning and action are related to language. It means that a speaker saying words is not describing some situation only, but also be considered as doing some action.

We have been considering some ways in which we interpret the meaning of sentence in terms of what the speaker of those sentences intended to convey. What we have not yet explored is the fact that we also know how speakers intend us to interpret what they say. In general terms, we can recognize the type of act performed by a speaker in uttering a sentence. The use of speech acts covers actions such as requesting, commanding, questioning, and informing.

There are two kinds of speech acts. Those are direct speech acts and indirect speech acts:

- Direct speech acts

Direct speech acts is used to ask a question. When a speaker does not know something and asks the hearer to provide the information, he or she will

typically produce a direct speech acts. For example: can you ride a bicycle? It asks about the ability that we can ride a bicycle or not.

- Indirect speech

Indirect speech is used to perform the action of requested. For example: "can you pass the salt?" It is not performing as a question, but performs the action requested. This request has been presented with a question. There is another example that shows indirect speech: "you left the door open." This utterance has the form of statement, but if we say this sentence to someone who has just come into a room and it is cold outside, it will be understood to have made not as a statement, but a request. It is requesting indirectly that the person close the door.

So, we can differ direct and indirect speech acts based on the function of that utterance. Not from the form of utterance.

According to Austin (1983: 236), there are three categorization of speech acts:

1. Locutionary acts: the production of sounds and words with meanings. For example: "it's dark here". It deals with the act of saying that the situation here is dark.

2. Illocutionary acts: the issuing of an utterance with conventional communicative force achieved "in saying". For example: "it's dark here"

the sentence refers to the speaker's intention of uttering the words such as request for someone to turn on the lamp

3. Perlocutionary act:the actual effect achieved "by saying". For example: "it's dark here". The perlocutionary act refers to the effects of this utterance has on the thoughts of other person such as someone turn on the lamp.

The locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts are together referred as speech act. Thus, the most important element which brings the significance of speech act is the illocutionary act.

2.1.3 Illocutionary Acts

According to Coulthard, illocutionary act is the act which is performed in saying something. It deals with the speaker's intention of uttering the words (1987:18). It means that every spoken utterance has illocutionary act in it. There should be intention of doing something. Performing illocutionary act is the way to make a request, an order, a promise, and which responses can be form of action.

There are two experts who explain about illocutionary acts, they are Austin and Searle. Austin divides illocutionary acts into five, those are: verdictives, exercitives, commisives, behavities, and expositives. While Searle also divides illocutionary acts into five, such as: assertive, directive, commisive, expressive, and declarative. Here the writer chooses the theory of Searle to analyze the data because it is simple and easy to be understood,

besides it the theory of Searle is focus on how the listener can understand about what speaker said.

Searle (1979) states that there are five classifications of illocutionary acts. These classifications can analyze the illocutionary acts deeper.

1. Assertive/ Representative

Speech acts which described states or events in the world. In uttering assertive, the speaker conveys his belief that some proposition is true. So it can be judged for truth value. It can be uttered in a form of claim, report, statement, conveys and description. For example, when someone reports 'Honda is Japan's automotive product', he conveys his belief that the proposition Honda is Japan's product is true and describes Honda is Japan's product as a states or events in the world.

2. Directive

Speech acts is to cause the hearer to take a particular action. By ordering, advising, requesting, commanding, begging, challenging, or pleading, the speaker is trying to get the listener to carry out some action. Ex: "Could you give me money please?" So, directive is the utterance of the speaker to get the addressee to do something.

3. Commisive

Commisive is speech acts which commit a speaker to do some future action. By uttering a commisive, the speaker shows commitment of himself to do some future of action. Commisive can be uttered in the form of promise, guarantees, contracts, threat, and other types of commitments for example 'If you don't stop talking, I will shut your mouth'. The speaker is commiting himself to shut the hearer mouth if he does not stop talking".

4. Expressive

Speech acts that express that express speaker's feeling or emotion. It can be uttered in the form of Congratulation, excuses, and thanks. For example, when someone uttered an utterance such as "Happy graduation Jane" the speaker wants to express his / her feeling of Jane's graduation.

5. Declarative

Declarative is speech acts which change the reality as it has been declared. E.g. Baptism, pronouncing someone guilty, arresting and firing. For example, when someone says 'You're fired' he is declaring someone's job to be resigned.

2.1.4 Contexts

Context is background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer and which contributes to hearer's interpretation of what speaker's mean by given utterance. An understanding of how language function in context is central to an understanding of the relationship between what is said and what is understood in spoken and written discourse. The context of situation of what someone says is, therefore, crucial to understanding and interpreting the meaning of what is being said. This includes the physical context, the social context and the mental worlds and roles of the people involved in the interaction. Each of these impacts on what we say and how other people interpret what we say.

When we receive a linguistic meaning, we pay attention to many other factors apart from the language itself. If we are face to face with other person sending the message, then we notice what they are doing with their face, eyes, and body while speaking: maybe they smiled, or shook their fist, or looked away. In a spoken message we notice thequality of the voice as well. Maybe the speaker's voice was shaking, or they had a particular accent, or hesitated, or slurred their words. These are paralinguistic features of a spoken message, which are lost if we write the message down. They exist in written messages too, where we may be influenced by handwriting or typography, and by whether the message is in an expensive book.

We also influenced by the situation in which we receive message, by our cultural and social relationship with the participants, by what we know and what we assume the sender knows. These factors take us beyond the study of language, in a narrow sense, and force us to look at other areas of inquiry (mind, body, society, physical, in fact). There are good arguments for limiting a field of study to make it manageable, but it is also true to say that the answer to the question of what gives discourse its unity may be impossible to give without considering the world ar large, the context (cook: 1989).

There are different kinds of context to be considered. One kind is described as *linguistic context,* also known as *co-text.* The co-text of a word is the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence. This surrounding co-text has a strong effect on what we think the word means. We have already noted that the word *bank* is a homonym, a form with more than one meaning. We usually do so on the basic of linguistic context.

According to Yule (1996:129) more generally, we know what words mean on the basis of another type of context, it is described as physical *context*. If we see the word *BANK* on the wall of a building in a city, the physical location will influence our interpretation. Our understanding of much of what we read and hear is tied to physical context, particularly the time and place, in which we encounter linguistic expression.

According to Hymes (1964) categorized social context into five, such as: addressor (who are speaking the utterance), addressee (who are they speaking

to), audience (who are listening the speaker utterance), topic (what is being talked about), setting (when and where they are speaking).

Hymes also cathegorized context in the big scale, such as: channel (how the relationship between the participants in the event), code (languages, dialects, or style of language used), message form (what form is meant, conversation, debate, speech, fairy tales, sonnets, love letters, etc), event (what kind of event it is), genre (more global than event), key (evaluation of the event, it is good or not), purpose (What meant by participants should occur as a result of communicative events).

Social Factors and Dimensions explain why people speak differently in different context. Examining the way people use language in different social contexts provides many information about how language works. It is possible that people say the same thing in different ways. Why people choose different way to say something is actually affected by social factors and social dimensions (Holmes, 2001). Some kind of social factor that influence someone to use certain word such as: the participants: who you are talking to and who is speaking, the setting: the social context of the talk or where they speak, the topic: the topic of the discussion or what they are talking about, and the function: the reasons why they are speaking.

2.1.5 Previous Study

There are several writers who have studied about illocutionary acts. Such as Indriawati (2008) investigates Illocutionary acts used by "Indonesia This Morning" presenters on Metro TV, she finds that there are four types of illocutionary acts, those are representative, directive, commissive, and expressive. The result the presenters do not use the declarative acts in this research. She also found that the presenters also used four functions of illocutionary acts that based on the social purposes: competitive, convivial, collaborative and conflictive. The most frequent functions of illocutionary acts are used by "Indonesia This Morning" presenters on Metro TV are collaborative

Issana A. Muskananfola (2009) investigates illocutionary acts used I "Barack Obama's victory speech and Inaugural speech." She finds five kinds of illocutionary acts, those are assertive, directive, commisive, expressive, and declarative utter by Barrack Obama in his speech. From the previous studies above, it hasn't been found a researcher who is interested in observing assertive illocutionary acts which expresses in drama, and most of researcher observe the literary work to find kind of illocutionary act, without focusing in one kind of illocutionary acts.

Those are some research that has used illocutionary acts as their theory of analyzing. However, all of them analyze about all kind of illocutionary acts that is used in literary work. The differences among those researches above

research are from the object. The previous most of the previous researcher take the object of direct speech, while the data of this research is taken from drama, beside it, this research only focus on assertive acts that used in the character of drama "The Zoo Story", not analyzing all kind of illocutionary acts. Therefore, the researcher takes this research because there is no one analyzes assertive acts in The Zoo Story drama. Hopefully it can increase new knowledge about assertive acts that is used in The Zoo Story.