CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter explains the review of related literature, discussing the theories. They are consists of discourse analysis and speech acts. Whereas speech divided into three categories, they are the kinds of speech acts, speech acts classification, and the use of speech acts.

2.1   Discourse Analysis

According to Van Dijk (1997: 15), says that "the analysis of discourse as action and interaction". It means, discourse is a language that is used in communicating. This can be formed spoken and written text. But a language will not be straightly happened a communication without a process interaction. As example: the person says something to someone else. This is an interaction because can be influenced each other and that effect is   called an action. Here can be described that speech act is a part of model discourse, because speech act is an utterance is performed by an act is to say to something.

2.1.2   Speech Acts

According to Austin (1962a) in Vanderveken and Kubo (2001:25), states that "the primary units of meaning in the use and comprehension of language are not isolated propositions but rather speech act of the type

illocutionary acts". It means, the speakers have to make meaningful utterances of elementary sentences that always have a relation with propositional content to the world with a certain illocutionary force.

But according to Austin's (1962) in Wood and Kroger (2000: 4), says that "language is action". It means, it is pointed out that people do more than just communicate with language — they use it to *do* things as well. Like as example speaking is an act in itself, such as when we say "l promise".

2.1.2.1 Kinds of Speech Acts

According Austin in Coulthard (1977: 17) reconsiders the senses in which 'to say something' and concludes that in 'issuing an utterance' a speaker can perform three acts simultaneously:

2.1.2.1.1 Locutionary act

A *locutionary* act which is the act *of* saying something in the full sense of 'say'.

2.1.2.1.2 Illocutionary act

An *illocutionary* act which is an act performed *in* saying something, the act identified by the explicit performative.

2.1.2.1.3 Perlocutionary act

A perlocutionary act, the act performed by or as a result of saying.

Based on Austin's statements above, it can be described that Locutionary act is actual words of the utterances or sentences, example: "Love her!" Illocutionary act is what speaker means to convey, example: "He argued (or advises, orders, etc) me to love her". And Perlocutionary act is hearer reaction to what the speaker says, example: "He persuaded me to love her".

2.1.2.2 Speech Acts Classifications

According to Searle (1976) in Mey's book is entitle "Pragmatics" (2001: 119-122), states that there are five speech act categories that Searle ends up establishing are:

2.1.2.2.1 Representatives

The speech acts are assertions about a state affair in the world (hence they are also called 'assertives'; Leech 1983: 128), and thus carry the values 'true' or 'false'.

2.1.2.2.2 Directives

As the name says, these speech acts embody an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something, to 'direct' him or her towards some goal (of the speaker's, mostly).

2.1.2.2.3 Commissives

Like directives, commissives operate a change in the world by means of creating an obligation; however, this obligation is created in the speaker, not in the hearer, as in the case of the directives.

2.1.2.2.4 Expressives

This speech act, as the word says, expresses an inner state of the speaker; the expression is essentially subjective and tells us nothing about the world.

2.1.2.2.5 Declarations

Declarations bring about some alternation in the status or condition of the referred to object to object solely by virtue of the fact that the declaration has been successfully performed.

Based on the five categories above, it can be concluded that representatives are central to language use because they are the means by which speaker say how things are, they assert or represent their belief of something, Example: "The air can not be seen by our eyes but just can be felt." Commissive is promise or commit, example: "I will do and register my thesis on June 14 so that I can join the exam of the second wave". Directive is an act of forcing to ask the hearer to do something, example: "make me a cup of coffee, please!" Expressive is an act of showing our feelings, example: "Congratulation on your kindness for this time and hopefully, you are happy with him." Declarative is an act of having a meaning in order that the speaker make new something like status, condition, and so on, example: "My examiner forgives my mistake".

2.1.2.3 The use of Speech Acts

According to Sadock (1974) and Levinson (1983) states that literal force hypothesis posits a restricted set of clause types and a restricted set of illocutionary forces and it claims that there is a one- to- one relationship between them as summarized (1):

a).The declarative type is associated with asserting, b) The interrogative type is associated with questioning, c) The imperative type is associated with requesting, and c)   The exclamative type is associated with exclaiming.

Based on clause of types above, they can be explained that declarative is a statement represents a character of the person, interrogative is a sentence question form or has the question mark (?), imperative is a type of sentence that gives advise or instructions or that expresses a request or command, and exclamative is a type of sentence expressing the strong feeling through interjection and can be ended by exclamative mark (!).

2.2   Context of Situation

Crystal (1997: 88) states that "context of situation is a specific term in Firthian linguistic theory delivering from the work of the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski". It means that it can be seen as a multiple phenomenon, its various facets being relatable on the other hand to features of the external world, and on the other hand to different levels of linguistics

analysis, such as phonetics, grammar, semantics (Crystal, Ibid). In brief, context of situation refers to the whole set of external – world features considered to be relevant in the particular level (s) of linguistics of an utterance.

According to Hymes (1964) as quoted in Brown and Yule (1983: 38) set about specifying the features of context which may be relevant to the identification of a type of speech event, they are as follows:

1. Addressor is the speaker or writer who produces the utterances.

2. Addressee is the hearer or reader who is the recipient of utterances.

3. Audience is the presence of over hearers may contribute to the specification of the speech event.

4. Topic is what is being talked about.

5. Setting is both in terms of where the event is situated in place and time, and in terms of the physical relations of the interactants with respect to posture and gesture and facial expression.

6. Channel is how is contact between the participants in the event being maintained – by speech, writing, signing, smoke signals.

7. Code is what language, or dialect, or style of language is being used.

8. Message – form is what form is intended – chat, debate, sermon, fairy-tale, sonnet, lover-letter, etc.

9. Event is the nature of the communicative event within which a genre may be embedded – thus a sermon or prayer may be part of the larger event, a church service.

10. Key is which involves evaluation – was it a good sermon, a pathetic explanation, etc.

11. Purpose is what did the participants intend should come about as a result of the communicative event.

Based on types of speech event, in this study, the writer used four of the features of context of situation by Hymes (1964) which incooperate addressor, addressee, topic and setting. They are used to interpret the social context of the text used in the utterances of Anas Urbaningrum in which meaning are being exchanged, like what is said by Brown and Yule (1983: 40) that the more features of the context is known, the more the interpretation of what is likely to be said is able to predict.