

CHAPTER 2

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics as a branch of linguistic is the study of meaning which relates to the context or the external meaning of language unit. It explains the way language use understood well after connecting it to the situation where, when and by whom it is uttered.

Yule (1996:3) explains pragmatics is branch of linguistics that is concerned with the study of meaning as communication by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently, has more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances and what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. This definition shows that meaning is important to be known or to be understood by everyone in doing communication. The communication will be success if the listener (or reader) understands what the speaker (or writer) said.

Yule (1996:3) also explains pragmatics as below:

- a) Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning
- b) Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning
- c) Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said
- d) Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance

Furthermore, Yule (1996:4) in his book mentioned that the advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of action that they are performing when they speak. Levinson (1983:5) defines that pragmatics is the study of language use, that is the study of relation between language and context which is basic to an account of language understanding which involves the making of inferences which will connect what is said to what is mutually assumed or what has been said before.

Leech (1983:36) states that pragmatics involves problem solving both from the speaker's point of view and from the hearer's point of view. The problem of speaker's point of view is how to produce an utterance which will make the result. Then Mey (1994:3) has suggested that pragmatics is a science that has something to do with language and its users.

2.2 Speech Act

Every utterance is performing actions or meaning of the speaker. As Yule (1996:47) states that in attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce utterance containing grammatical structures and words, they perform action via those utterances. From Yule's statement, it can be grasped that an utterance not only consists of grammatical structure and words, but also has actions or meaning. In general, speech acts are the acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed.

Speech act theory was first developed by J.L Austin in a series of lecturer at Oxford University. His book "How to do Thing with Words" is the first to introduce the idea of speech acts, analyzing the relationship between utterance and performatives. Austin (1962:94) states that speech acts is a theory in which to say something is to do something. It means that when someone says something, he or she is not only saying something, but also uses it to do things or perform in act.

Austin differs the kind of speech acts into three kinds, they are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. The following are the explanation of kinds of speech act according to Austin.

a) Locutionary Act

A locutionary act is an act how a person produces the utterance or to produce a meaningful linguistic expression. When the user uses his/her organ of speech to produce utterance, then, indirectly there is the locutionary act in his/her utterance. In other word, locutionary act is the act of the speaker inusing his/her organ of speech to produce utterances. For example, "I promise to give you some money", the moment when the utterance is being said by the speaker by using the organ of speech is called lcutionary act.

b) Illocutionary Act

In every utterance, there must be a function in it. The function or meaning which is found in the utterance is called illocutionary act. For utterance, “I promise to give you some money”, it is not only a statement, but also binds the speaker to what she/he has just said. This is because that utterance intention is the fact that the speaker will do something. Therefore, the illocutionary act of an utterance above is the act of promising. Yule (1996, p.48) explains that illocutionary acts are certain communicative force of utterance, such as performing, apologizing, offering, and questioning. According to Austin (1962, p.108), we said that we also perform illocutionary acts such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, utterances which have a certain (conventional) force. The illocutionary act carried out by a speaker meaning of an utterance is the act viewed in terms of the utterance’s significance within a conventional system of social interactions. An illocutionary act refers to the type of function the speaker intends to fulfill, or the type of action the speaker intends to accomplish in the course of producing an utterance. It is an act accomplished in speaking. Illocutionary acts related to speaker’s intention. In other word every speakers has the intention through their utterance. For example: “It is rain outside”, that utterance could be has meaning the speaker wish the hearer use umbrella if the hearer want to go outside, or the speaker want to hearer not to go outside and stay still in the room.

c) Perlocutionary Act

Perlocutionary act is the effect of the utterance which the speaker said to the hearer. The example “I promise to give you some money”, the effect of that utterance can be a happy one. This is a result of the fact that the hearer really needs some money. But, it can also give the opposite effect to the hearer. If the hearer is a very rich person who does not need any money from the speaker, she/he (the hearer) may feel angry because of the utterance. The hearer will feel as if she/he is being mocked.

Contrary to what occurs at the illocutionary level, perlocutions are not directly achieved by the conventional force of an utterance. They can be intentional or unintentional, and they might involve unexpected effects, different from those of an illocutionary act. Also, perlocutions occur at a further level, as the interlocutor’s

actual reaction to the speech act. A perlocutionary effect of the utterance “the soup you cooked was very poor” might be that one’s interlocutor is chagrined, gets angry, pours the soup down the sink, or all three.

The distinction between illocution and perlocution is not clear cut, and it is not at all apparent that the perlocutionary level can be fully considered as a single level of action embodied in a given utterance (Austin 1962: 108–115). In order to identify the difference it might help to distinguish between the effects that are “built in” to given expression by virtue of its illocutionary force, and those that are not. For instance a (felicitous) order just by virtue of its illocutionary force will generate an obligation in the person who receives it, but how the individual acts upon the obligation (complying, refusing, questioning, being offended by it, and so on) belongs to the realm of perlocutions. The locutionary and the perlocutionary levels of the speech act have generated much debate but the illocutionary level is the nucleus of the Austinian theory and its later developments (Bublitz & Norrick, 2011, p.381).

2.3 Classification of Illocutionary Act

This study uses the speech act theory from Searle especially illocutionary act. The five classification of illocutionary act that Searle develops are as follows:

a. Representative

Representative is kind of speech acts that state or express what the speaker believes to be case or not (Searle in Yule, 1996:53). It shows the truth condition of the meaning of the utterance. The example of this type are agree, deny, affirm, allege, announce, believe, boast, complain, conclude, forecast, inform, insist, predict, report, state, and suggest.

For example, “I’m a good guy”, the intention of this utterance is to show that the speaker tries to make the hearer believe that the speaker is a good guy. Another example, “The sun rises in the east”, this utterance shows a fact and general truth that the sun really rises in the east. This is an absolute fact which is trusted by everyone.

b. Directive

Directive is speech act that speakers use to get someone else to do something (Searle in Yule, 1996:54). It is a condition when the speaker requests the hearer to

carry out some actions or to bring out some states or affairs. Directive illocutionary act used by the speaker to get someone else to do something. This directive can make the hearer under an obligation. Verbs denoting members of this type are advice, ask, beg, bid, command, demand, forbid, order, recommend, and request.

For instance, “could you lend me a pen?” this utterance shows that the speaker requests a pen from someone else. He/she indirectly order the other person to lend him a pen. This gesture is also available in a more direct way as “lend me a pen!” the intention of this utterance is to make the hearer to perform the action conveyed in the utterance itself. Another example, ”Don“t be noisy!” this utterance contains a prohibition which can make the hearer silent. This is usually done when someone/the speaker feels annoyed with the crowded made by the hearer or people around.

c. Commissive

Commissive is kind of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to do some in the future (Searle in Yule, 1996:54). Commissive express what the speaker“s intends. Including in this type is offer, promise, swear, threat, and volunteer.

For example, “I will come to your home tonight” this example shows that the speaker intends to come to the hearer“s home at the night time of the day the utterance is said. Therefore, the speaker commits that he/she will come to the speaker“s home at night. In simple English the term of this speech act commonly called promised. Then, “I promise to give you some money”, this utterance also shows a promise of the speaker to the hearer. It shows what the speaker has to do in the future.

d. Expressive

Expressive is speech acts that stated what the speaker feels (Searle in Yule, 1996:53). It expresses the psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislike, joy, or sorrow. They can be caused by something the speaker does or the hearer does, but they are about the speaker“s experience. The example of expressive are apologize, appreciate, blame, commiserate, congratulate, mock, pardon, praise, thank, and welcome.

For example, “I“m sorry”, “I like it”, “Thank you”. These examples show how

the speaker feels about a situation. In time when the speaker spoils coffee over someone else's shirt, he/she will say "I'm sorry". When in time the speaker is given a slice of cheese and likes it, then he/she will say "I like it" or "Thank you".

e. Declarative

Declarative is kind of illocutionary acts that can change world by the utterance which is produced. As Searle in Yule (1996:53) states that declarative is kind of speech acts that change the world via their utterance. The word „change“ which is intended here refers to any situation. It can be the changing of the status of a person or the ownership of something. The verbs which belong to declaration are adjourn, appoint, baptize, christen, declare, communicate, name, resign, sentence, and veto.

For example when a priest says, "I declare you husband and wife" the Priest (in the context of marriage) has the privilege to declare marriage. When this utterance is performed, the man and woman are changed from single into married people from the moment on. On the contrary, if the speaker is not a priest or has not the privilege to marry people, the utterance will not be effective. Another example when the boss says, "I'm telling you to attend the meeting" this utterance shows that the boss as the speaker has the right to appoint the employee as the hearer to do what he said.

2.4 The Function of Illocutionary Act

Searle in Leech (1983:104) has proposed the illocutionary acts based on its functions. It is based on how illocutionary acts relate to the social goals or purposes of arranging and setting up in a polite ways. There are four types of illocutionary act functions such as competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive. The form types of illocutionary acts functions are described below

- a. Competitive aims at competing with the social purposes, such as ordering, asking, demanding, and begging. It is intended to produce some effect through action by the hearer. For example, "I ask your money, please" it is kind of asking.
- b. Convivial aims in compliance with the social purposes, for instance offering, inviting, greeting, thanking and congratulating. For example, "can I help you with this?" it is kind of offering.
- c. Collaborative aims at ignoring the social purposes as like asserting, reporting,

announcing, and instructing. It commits the speaker to the truth of expressed proposition. For example, “I like this book.” It is kind of reporting.

- d. Conflictive aims at conflicting against the social purposes, such as threatening, accusing, and reprimanding. If you say, “I will say to your father.” It is kind of threatening.

2.5 Theory of Context

According to Mey (2001, p.39), context is a dynamic, not a static concept: it is also to be understood as the continually changing surrounding, in the widest sense, that enable the participant in the communication process to interact, and which the linguistic expressions of their interaction become intelligible. Allan and Jaszczot (2012, p.114) explains that the context is a sequence of parameters which include (at least) a world, a speaker, a time, and a location. We must invoke the context to determine what an ambiguous sentences means. According to Mey (2001, p.13), this may be OK, if by „context“ we understand all the factor that play a role in producing and understanding the utterances.

An example the following dialogue: (two linguistics, call them Jacob and Mark, are coming out of a lecture hall at university which his neither home territory, but where Jacob has been before; so he thinks he knows the campus, more or less). Jacob: Do you know the way back to the dining hall? we can go in my car (Mark get into the car; after the first turn, he starts giving directions, which greatly amazes Jacob, and irritates him a little; he was under the impression that he needed to guide the other, not the other way round. After several more turns- which Jacob is taking at greater and greater speed, so the other does not get a chance to interfere – Mark say). Mark: oh I thought you did not know the way to the campus (to which Jacob replies). Jacob: I thought you did not know! (whereupon they both start laughing).

In the case like this, the classical concept of context as that which has been the case up to and including the present moment makes no sense. There is no way in which the original utterance “Do you know the way back to the dining hall?” can be interpreted correctly. Clearly, Mark takes Jacob’s utterance not as a real question, but as a pre-request. Jacob, on the other hand, assumed that Marks was not familiar with the campus, so wanted to give him a ride. This why he was surprised at Mark giving him direction: that activity only makes sense if you know where you are

going.

2.6 Previous Studies

In this section, I review which were related to the main issues namely movie script and illocutionary acts and speech act.

First, Dewi (2015) conducted a study on speech acts in “The Great Gatsby” movie script performed by the main characters of the movie namely Jay Gatsby, Nick Carraway, Daisy Buchanan, Tom Buchanan, Jordan Baker, and Dr. Jack Thompson. The study found that there were four types of speech acts employed inside the study. They were representative, directive, commissive, and expressive. However, the study found that the most frequent type was directive act. The study also found that direct speech was the most frequent strategies employed by the characters since it related to the direct relationship between a structure and the function.

Second, Mardianti (2014) conducted a study on speech acts performed by the main character of “Doraemon” comic the 1st volume. She proposed two problems in this study as a limitation of the topic. The problems she proposed were the types of locutionary acts and types of illocutionary acts performed by the main character of “Doraemon” comic the 1st volume. The findings showed four types were employed in the comic namely representative, commissive, directive, and expressive. The results also showed that mostly directive sentences were used to express gratitude, statement and advice. Imperative sentences were employed to express order or request. Interrogative sentences were performed to express questions. However, the writer did not find the types of illocutionary acts which contain declaration since the character did not have authority to change someone’s world through his words. According to the results, the most frequent type was directive act since the addresser wanted the addressee to do some actions intended by the addresser.

Third, Ragil (2012) also conducted the study about speech acts. He limited his study on the types and functions of illocutionary acts in “Cars 2” movie script. The findings showed that there were four types employed in the utterances namely representative or assertive, expressive, directive, and commissive. All characters in the movie script mostly performed representative or assertive type since the type made the characters commit to the truth of proposition. The second finding was the

functions of illocutionary acts. In the study, the writer found four major functions of illocutionary acts employed in the script. They were collaborative function, convivial function, competitive function, and conflictive function.

And according to previous studies above, all of researchers only focus on speech act and type of illocutionary act used in data, however this research used different approach to analyze the transcript data not only focusing on type of illocutionary but also the effect of illocutionary for hearer through the utterance that called perlocutionary act.

