

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this second chapter, the researcher presents theoretical framework and related studies

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatic studies refer to the social language. It includes what we say, how we say, our body language and whether suitable to the given situations. It is about how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation. It also distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of direct communication.

According to Yule (1996: 133) "*Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning as distinct from word or sentence meaning*". According to Yule (1996: 3), there are four definition of pragmatics, namely (1) field of that examines the meaning of the speaker, (2) field of that examines the meanings according to its context, (3) field of, exceeds the study of the meaning of the spoken, examines meanings communicated or communicated by the speaker and (4) field of that examines the social forms of expression under the limit range of participants involved in a particular conversation. So it can be conclude that pragmatics is a

general study about how context affects speakers to say in interpreting the meaning of a sentence in relation to the utterance situation.

Meyer (2009:48) states that pragmatics is part of the field of linguistics and semiotics that studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. Pragmatics includes utterances in speech acts theory, talk in interaction and other approaches language behaviour in linguistics. Not like semantics, which examines the conventional sense in a particular language, pragmatics studies how the transmission of meaning depends not only on the structural and linguistic knowledge of the speaker and the listener, but also in the context of the speech, the existing knowledge about the people involved, the inferred intent of the speaker, and other factors in this respect, pragmatics explains. The ability to understand the meaning intended by the other speakers called pragmatics competence. So pragmatics is concerned with how factors such as time, place and the social relationship between speaker and listener affect the ways in which language is used to perform different functions.

2.1.2 Speech Acts

According to Savas (1994:460) “A central concept to pragmatics is that of the speech act”. It means that what the speaker actually does in uttering a sentence. Speech act as the action performed via utterance was developed firstly by Austin and Searle. In attempting to express them, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words. They perform actions via those utterances. In this case, Austin and Searle developed speech theory from the

basic belief that language used to perform actions. Speech act theory is a state acts to accompany communication in accomplish an ideas. So communication is not only the language, but also with an action. In daily life, people use language as a game because that language contains of various rules. They are following that rules to do something with an act. Speech act is the basic unit of the language used to express meaning, act and an expression that expresses of the intent. In utters a sentence, someone does not only say something by uttering that sentence. When she said a sentence, it means that she did something specific act. So speech act is an individual phenomenon, psychological, and determined by the speakers of the language skills in dealing with certain situations. It is emphasized to the meaning of acts, while the event thought the event is more focused on the purpose.

According to Searle (1979:21), resists the idea that conversation is governed by constitutive rules. This view places speech act at very crux of the study of the language, meaning, and communication. Thus, viewing speech acts as the basic unit of communication allows Searle to explicitly associate speech act with the study of language: it is interpretation of meaning. There are a series of analytic connections between the notion of speech acts, its means that what the speaker means, what the sentence uttered means, what the speaker intends, what the hearers understand, and what the rules governing the linguistic elements. Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded which speech acts are part of linguistic competence. Language can be used for speech act because people share rules that create the acts that say what is meant.

According to Renkema (2004:22) “Every human being performs speech act, then they respond of listener can be either direct or indirect act and the action includes illocutionary act”. Illocutionary acts are the real actions which are performed by the utterance, where saying equal doing, as in betting, plighting one truth, welcoming and warning. According to Renkema (2004:21), illocutionary acts are the acts which are committed by producing an utterance; by uttering a promise, a promise is made; by uttering a threat, a threat is made.

According to Austin (2006:103), when speaking (or writing, for that matter), we perform various “acts”: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. The difference between locutionary and illocutionary acts is sometimes referred to as, respectively, the difference between “saying” and “doing.” Thus, if I utter *Leave*, I am on one level producing an imperative sentence having a specific form (the base form of the verb with an implied *you*) and meaning (e.g. ‘depart’). This is the locutionary force of this utterance, what has thus far in this chapter been referred to as being a component of grammar. Additionally, I have intentions when uttering this sentence specifically I am using what is known as a directive to get someone to do something. This is the illocutionary force of the utterance. But utterances also have effects on the individuals to whom they are directed: uttering *Leave* may have the effect of actually causing an individual or individuals to leave, it may upset them, it may have no effect, etc.

2.1.3 Types of Speech Acts

2.1.3.1 Locutionary Acts

According to Austin (2006:102), locutionary act is the content of the utterance itself. It's an utterance regarded in terms of its intrinsic meaning or reference, as distinct from its function or purpose in context. Speaking certain words with a particular pronunciation, grammatical structure or meaning (i.e. the linguistic features of a speech act).

2.1.3.2 Illocutionary Acts

According Austin (2006:105), illocutionary acts is performing an act in saying something (e.g. one of the five illocutionary types: assertive, commissive, directive, declaration, and expressive). Every utterance in the illocutionary acts is fulfilled by four felicity condition. It can be meet in every condition can be seen called the characteristic is fulfilled. Based on the explain above, it can be conclude that illocutionary act is the meaning intended by the speaker. It's linguistic that performed in uttering certain word in a given context. So it is focus of attention if we want it to be successful.

2.1.3.3 Perlocutionary Acts

According Oishi (2006:4) "Perlocutionary acts is an achieving certain effects *by* saying something (i.e. generally an effect or reaction on the hearer(s). The interpretation of the message by the hearer. It is an act whereby a speaker expects hearers are not only understood but to act on that understanding.

2.1.4 Classification of Illocutionary Acts

Searle's (1979: 10) states that there are five classifications of speech acts, namely representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

2.1.4.1 Representatives

According to Searle (1979:10) "Representative is the point or purpose of the members of the representative class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition". According to Meyer (2009:50) "Representative is utterances reporting statements of fact verifiable as true or false". It means that the act in which the words state that speakers and writers use language what they know or believe to be the case. All of the members of the representative class are assessable on the dimension of assessment which includes true and false. It concerns with facts. Such as claiming, describing, putting forward, boasting, and concluding, hypothesizing, insisting, predicting, suggest, complain, report, tell, affirm, assert, argue, inform etc.

Example: *"Fire! Fire, everyone get up! Fire! It's a real fire! Get out of bed! Get up, it's a fire. This isn't a practice. You guys, get up. Come on, darling, get up. It's a fire, it's not a drill"*.

In the utterance, the speaker wants the hearer to do something (Fire, everyone get up). The speaker uses the word "it's a real fire" indicating the illocutionary acts of assertive (informing)

2.1.4.2 Directives

Searle (1979:10) states that the illocutionary point of these consist of the fact that they are attempts of varying degrees, and hence, more precisely, they are determinates of the determinable which includes attempting by the speaker to get

the hearer to do something. Such as requesting, commanding, inviting, forbidding, suggesting, asking, ordering, advising, begging. According Meyer (2009:50), “Directive is utterances intended to get someone to do something”. It means that the act in which the words are aimed at making the hearer to take particular actions, they try to make the addressee perform an action. It is also prospective one cannot tell other people to do something in the past. etc.

Example: *“Excuse me, excuse me. Get up here, right now. Get up here! Please, go home. Home, home”*.

In the utterance, the speaker wants the hearer to do something (please, go home). The speaker uses the word “please” indicating the illocutionary acts of directive (requesting)

2.1.4.3 Commisives

Searle (1979:10) explain that those illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker (again in Varying degrees) to some future course of action. Such as promising, planning, vowing, betting, opposing, volunteering, refusing, threatening etc. According Meyer (2009:50) “Commissive is utterances committing one to doing something”. It means that the act contain of the speaker to future action. Different from the speech acts commissive, directive speech acts only in its direction. Directive is to the listeners while commissive on the person of the speaker (Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono 2005:106). It commits the speaker to doing something in the future.

Example: *“You're going to be fine, Moll. I promise”*.

In the utterance above, the speaker commits herself to come on time (future action). The speaker uses the word “promise” indicating the illocutionary acts of commissive (promising).

2.1.4.4 Expressives

According Searle (1979:10), 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. Such as praising, admitting, deny, acknowledge, apologizing, congratulating, welcoming, deploring, regretting etc. According Meyer (2009:50) “Expressive is utterances expressing speaker attitudes”. It means that the act in which the words condition what the speaker feels. They express how the speaker feels about the situation.

Example: *“Welcome to Malibu, bitch!”*

In the utterance, the speaker receives a new people. The speaker uses the word “welcome” indicating the illocutionary acts of expressive (welcoming)

2.1.4.5.1 Declarative

According Meyer (2009:50) “Declarative is utterances bringing about a change in the state of affairs”. It means that the acts contain words and an expression that change the world by their very utterance. They change the state of the world in an immediate way. Because in this utterance needed a felicity condition so that it is meaningful sentences, then an additional step in understanding and then implementing this speech is to convince yourself that it is indeed the speaker has the authority to say what was said (Dardjowidjojo,

Soenjono 2005:107) such as I resign, I declare, I bet and so on. Example: “*Well, I'm frigging playing*”.

2.2 Related Research

There are two of related studies conducted in the research on the same topic about illocutionary acts. The first, the study by Habib Mustofa, (2009) titled “**Illocutionary Acts in Barack Obama’s Inaugural Speech**”. He analyzed about illocutionary acts used by Barack Obama in his inaugural speech. The design of this study is the descriptive qualitative research. The data conducted from inaugural speech. Based on the research finding and discussion, the most frequent assertive act performed by Obama is informing, the most frequent commesive act performed by Obama is promising, the most frequent expressive act performed by Obama is thanking, and the most frequent expressive act performed by Obama is declaring. The second, the study by Nuzulur Rohmah, (2008) titled “**Illocutionary Acts Used by Characters in "The Man with the Heart in the Highlands "William Saroyan’s**”. This study investigated illocutionary acts used by characters in “The Man with The Heart in The Highlands” William Saroyan’s and how do the characters perform illocutionary acts in this drama. The researcher chose this drama because many kinds of illocutionary act. In this study a descriptive qualitative method is used. The data are taken from text of drama entitle “The Man with The Heart in The Highlands” by William Saroyan. Searle’s theory was used to analyze data. This study founded types of illocutionary acts used by characters, namely representative act, directive act, commisive act, and

expressive act. This study did not find illocutionary acts of declarative acts. Kinds of representative acts used are asserting, suggesting, boasting, complaining, reporting, answering, and disagreeing. Directive act in this analysis contains the acts of ordering, commanding, requesting, and advising. The commissive act also constitutes the act of agreeing, promising, and offering. In addition, the expressive acts used by characters are greeting, thanking, and apologizing.

After looking at those studies, the researcher concludes that this research is reasonable to conduct. It is because the object is certainly different from the previous researches. In the case of analyze, besides it classifies the utterances based on Searle's theory. It also analyzes how those illocutionary acts are employed and responded by the characters in Wild Child. Nevertheless, the researcher did not find illocutionary acts of directives act in previous studies. This research concerns to pragmatic study that include in speech act, especially in the types of illocutionary acts used by the characters Wild Child Movie.