CHAPTER 2
THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter discusses the framework of the theories which support the understanding of the problems formulated in Chapter 1. This chapter consist the theory of pragmatics, speech acts, locutionary acts, perlocutionary acts, illocutionary acts, also previous related studies.

2.1. Pragmatics

According to Yule (1996:3) pragmatics is a study of meaning that is conveyed by the speaker or writer and interpreted by the listener or reader. This type of study necessarily involves interpreting what people mean in a given context and how that context affects what is being said. This approach also necessarily explores how the listener can make inferences about what is said to arrive at an interpretation of the meaning intended by the speaker. This type of research explores how many unwritten things are recognized as part of what is communicated. One could say that it is the investigation of the invisible meaning.

As outline Yule (1996:3) describe pragmatics as the study of speaker meaning, the study of contextual meaning, the study of how more gets communicated than it's said, the study of expression of relative distance. The advantage of studying pragmatics is that you can discuss about the implied meaning, assumptions, or type of action while speaking or having a dialogue. While we were talking, there is implied meaning or the context of the dialogue. It was about such an interpretation of what people mean in the right context and how that context affects what is being said by the speaker.

Leech (1983) explained pragmatics is study of meaning in communication in a speech situation. To analyze meaning with pragmatics approach it is necessary to have a situation that becomes the context of the dialogue or speech.

From some theories that I have mentioned above, we can conclude that pragmatics is study of language and context in communication. When

people having a conversation, they need to know that there is some implied meaning that appear when they are talking. They need to understand that there is a deeper meaning than an actual meaning, that is why there is a pragmatics to make people (listener or speaker) understand the language and the context of the dialogue.

2.2. Speech Acts Theory

Speech acts as we know is the acts that performs by a speaker in making an utterance, such as making request, statements, giving comments, etc., it contains an implied meaning considered in terms of the context of the message, the intention of the speaker, and the effect on the listener.

According to Austin (1962), we do not just use language to say things (to make statements), but also to do things (performs actions). What is utterance by the speaker has an implied meaning in it that might be have an effect to the listener or the reader. We cannot concentrate of statement that taken out of context because there is might be an implied meaning in that statement such as promises, invitations, and requests and many more. In some cases, we use speech to perform an action Austin (1975) he explains that performative verbs make the speaker perform an act. For example, performative utterances, are: "Please, close the door", "could you turn on the AC", "bring me some water". Sometimes, even though they do not contain performatives, there might be an implicitly. For example, "I will marry you" in that sentence, there is no performatives acts, but it is contain a promise that is being made.

There are three types of speech acts according to Austin (1962), they are: illocutionary, perlocutionary and locutionary acts. Among the three types of speech acts, illocutionary is the dominant in pragmatics.

2.2.1. Locutionary Acts

According to Austin (1962) locutionary are acts of speaking. They are just uttered an information, speaking or giving some questions. The acts that involved in the construction of speech, the speaker uttering certain sounds or produce a meaningful expression

Austin (1962) says that there is a difference between the utterance's locutionary meaning and its illocutionary utterance. However, without a knowledge of how these two words are used in some context, the criterion appears circular.

2.2.2. Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary acts are what the speaker is doing by uttering some words, for example, commanding, offering, promising, threatening, thanking, etc. Before I talk about illocutionary based on Searle (1969), Searle was Austin student who developed the Austin illocutionary act. Based on Austin (1962) illocutionary is divided into 5 kinds, they are:

a) Verdictive is an illocutionary act that consist some results of an assessment or decision based on certain reasons or facts. Examples of these acts are assessing, diagnosing, calculating, predicting, and etc.

b) Excercitives is when the speaker giving a decision for or against a course of action, for example ordering, recommending, and etc.

c) Commissives is the act of the speaker committing to an action, for example making a promises or making a gamble.

d) Behabitives is the expression of attitudes and behavior of people. For example, sorry, thank you, congratulations, etc.

e) Expositives the act of exposition which involves elaborating, executing arguments, clarifying and references. The speakers explain how their utterances fit into the line of

reasoning, for example, postulate and define, agree, and so on.

But, in this term paper, I do not use the illocutionary acts by Austin, I used the Searle theory about illocutionary act. Austin theory about illocutionary acts is developed by Searle because Searle think that Austin's categorization is only based on lexicography and the boundaries between the five categorizations is unclear. Searle (1969) classified the illocutionary acts into 5. They are:

a) Representatives based on Searle (1969), are acts that consist stating, suggesting, complaining, claiming and so on. Example: "We watched Spiderman yesterday"

b) Directives based on Searle (1969) is an illocutionary acts that are intended to make the interlocutors to make an acts according to the speech that utterance by the speaker, it's consists ordering, requesting, advising, and recommending. For example: "Can you please close the door?"

c) Commissives based on Searle (1969) is one of the illocutionary acts that require the speaker to be committed to doing something in the future. Examples are making promises, swearing, refuse, threaten, and guarantee.

d) Expressive based on Searle (1969) is the expression of attitudes and feelings about a situation or reaction to the attitudes and act of people. For examples, they are congratulating, grateful, regretting, apologizing, welcoming, and thanking

e) Declaratives based on Searle (1969), i.e. illocutionary causes change or conformity between proposition and reality. Examples are baptizing, firing, naming, and punishing.

From the explanation of illocutionary acts above, I conclude that the function of Illocutionary act is the function or implied of the words that is uttered by the speaker. Sometimes we do not just uttered speech with no purpose but the utterance might be concludes some implied meaning. So, in an illocutionary act it is not just saying something itself, but the act of saying something with the intention of.

2.2.3. Perlocutionary Acts

The last one is perlocutionary acts, according to Austin (1962) perlocutionary acts, are 'what we produce or achieve by saying something' such as convincing, persuading, telling, surprising, or misleading. In the simple way, perlocutionary acts is the reaction of the hearer. When the speaker utters some speech, the sentence has an effect that gives the hearer to do something. For example "It is hot in here" in perlocutionary acts, the hearer will turn on the AC or open a window.

In other words, perlocutionary acts are actions or states of mind that are brought about by or as a consequence of, saying something Austin (1962). Therefore, perlocutionary acts must be understood as a cause-and-effect relationship between two events whose cause is the production of speech by the speaker.

2.3. The Classification of Illocutionary Act

According to Yule (1996:53), illocutionary act classification based on Searle's theory, there are five type general functions that performs illocutionary acts, there are representatives, declarations, commissives, directives, and expressive classifications of speech act based on the theory of Searle.

2.3.1 Representative

Representative is one of the classifications of illocutionary act that state or express what the speaker believes to be case or not (Searle in Yule, 1996:53). Representatives are speech acts that the utterances are produced based on the speaker's see or observation of certain things then followed by stating a fact or opinion based on the observation. The point is representative is a speech acts that stating a fact or giving some opinion (Yule 1996:53). When the speaker says "The scenery is so beautiful", the utterance can be a fact or just some opinion.

The example of representative illocutionary act, such as: reminding, telling, asserting, denying, correcting, stating, guessing, predicting, reporting, describing, informing, insisting, assuring, agreeing, claiming, concluding, complaining, etc. Example: "The flower is beautiful." "She has a beautiful eyes, long hair, and cute smile." "Don't forget to submit your progress".

2.3.2 Directives

Directives is one of an illocutionary acts classification, that are intended to make the interlocutors to make an act according to the speech that utterance by the speaker (Yule 1996:53), it's consists ordering, requesting, advising, and recommending. It is a condition when the speaker utterance something and make the hearer produce some actions.

In short, directives speech acts are an utterance that used by the speaker to get the hearer or someone do something (Yule 1996:53) while having a conversation the speaker utterance might contain a ordering, advising, requesting, suggesting, defying, challenging, questioning, confirming, in short it makes the hearer to do something. For example:

"Can you please close the door?" "Give me your money."
"I suggest you to have a new job that worth you."

2.3.3 Commissives

According to (Yule 1996:54) commissives are those kind of speech acts that speaker use to commit themselves to some future actions. They express what the speaker intend.

The utterances commit the speaker to some future course of action, the utterance might contain promising, threatening, offering, refusal, pledges. In short commissives is one of the classification of illocutionary acts that require the speaker to be committed to doing something in the future. Example of the commissives illocutionary speech acts are: "I'll be back." "I'm going to marry you." "I promise to buy you some diamond ring." The context of the utterance that the speaker is making a promises

2.3.4 Expressive

Expressive is speech acts that stated what the speaker feels (Searle in Yule, 1996:53), in expressive, the speaker will state what they feel, the expression of attitudes and feelings about a situation or reaction to the attitudes and act of people.

They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. They can be caused by something the speaker does or the hearer does, but they are about the speaker's experience (Yule 1996:53). The example of expressive are apologize, appreciate, blaming, congratulate, mocking, praise, thank, and welcome.

Here is the example of Expressive illocutionary speech acts: "Congratulation on your new job!" "I'm sorry if I hurt you." "Thank you for the gift you gave me. "

2.3.5 Declarative

Declarative are one of those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance (Yule 1996:53) its causes change or conformity between proposition and reality. The causes change or conformity refer that it can be the changing of the status of a person or the ownership of something. The verbs which belong to declaration are appointing, baptizing, declaring, communicating, naming, resign, firing, etc. The example of declaratives are "I declare you as husband and wife now.", "The ball is out." "You're fired!"

2.4. Context

Pragmatics has been seen as the inquiry into the contribution context makes to meaning (Yule 1996:92), or the examination of contextual and speaker meaning i.e., the interpretation of what people mean by their utterances in a particular context and how the context influences what is being said (Yule 1996:3). Context is one of the important things while we are communicating with other people. Context plays a major role in the communication. It contributes both to what is communicated directly and to what is communicated indirectly. By understanding a context, it will make us easier to understand what people said while we were having a dialogue. It means that context is the basic knowledge of communication to understand the speaker utterance and the hearer can understand what the speaker means by their utterances.

As a consequence, the study of meaning has become the business of two distinct areas of inquiry in linguistics. Whereas semantics is concerned with the ways meaning is encoded in language, pragmatics focuses on meaning in context (Levinson 1983, Widdowson 1996b). The relationship between language and context has been of special interest. As a result of it, pragmatics is often defined as the study of the correspondence or systematic relation of a language to situation and context (Oller 1970:506; Richards et

al. 1992:284; Brown and Levinson in Yule 1996: 109), or "the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding" (Levinson 1983:20).

Based on the explanation above, I conclude that context is the most important part of communication. By understanding a context, it makes us easier to understand the meaning that appear or implies from an utterance. Therefore, the meaning from the utterances itself cannot easily understood without knowing the context or situation, the situation or the context where the utterance is produced must be well understood by the speaker and hearer to avoid misunderstood from the utterances.

2.5. Previous Related Studies

The relevant research on speech acts analysis has been made by Siahaan (2019) in his term paper entitled "An Analysis of Illocutionary acts in the Utterance of The Main Characters of Queen of Katwe Movie Script" This research focuses on finding out the classification of illocutionary speech act that used in Queen of Katwe Movie Script, and the finding out the interpret of the function of each illocutionary act performed in Queen of Katwe movie script, and last one is to find out the most dominant classification of illocutionary act found in Queen of Katwe movie script.

The research uses the descriptive qualitative method. The researcher found out the classifications of the illocutionary act used in the Queen of Katwe Movie Script. The result of the research shows that: there are 31 utterances of representative illocutionary act, 21 utterances of directives illocutionary acts, 8 utterances of commissives illocutionary acts, 19 utterances of expressive illocutionary acts and 1 declarative illocutionary speech act.

The second relevant research on speech acts studied pragmatically has been carried out by Hidayat (2016) in a journal entitled "Speech Acts: Force behind Words". The journal focuses explanation about speech acts, especially illocutionary acts with the classification of illocutionary speech acts. The purpose of this research was to find out the types of speech acts

and the classification of the illocutionary acts speech acts with the Searle's theory of illocutionary.

The third relevant research on speech acts studied pragmatically has been carried out by Violeta (2019) in her a term paper entitled "Speech Act Analysis of the Main Character in Maleficent Movie Script". The researcher uses the Descriptive Qualitative Method for the research. This research focuses on finding out the kinds of illocutionary acts that based on Searle's theory in the maleficent movie script that performed by the speakers in the movie script.

The reason I look for previous studies is because I need a reference for the theories that they are using in the term paper and how they are analyze the illocutionary act from the dialogue. I use the Siahaan's term paper entitled "An Analysis of Illocutionary acts in the Utterance of The Main Characters of Queen of Katwe Movie Script" as a reference how he conducts finding out the illocutionary act in the movie script, the second term paper I use as the related studies is the journal by Hidayat's entitled "Speech Acts: Force behind Words" as a reference how he classified the illocutionary acts speech acts with the Searle's theory of illocutionary. The last related studies that I use is from Violeta's term paper, I use her term paper as the references of the research approach and method that she uses for the research.

The different between my term paper and the previous related studies is in their term paper or journal, they are just finding out the illocutionary act and then classified the illocutionary act, in my term paper, I use the context to explain why I choose the illocutionary act based on the context and then I decide which illocutionary act that suitable based on the context.