

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This chapter discusses the basic concept of theories that is used for this research. Those are: theory of pragmatics, speech act theory, illocutionary acts, types of illocutionary acts, and the big five personality model, along with previous related studies that are related for this research.

#### **2.1 Theory of Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker or utterer and interpreted by an addressee or listener. It has more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. It is the study of speaker's meaning (Yule, 1996, p. 3). As Mey (1993, p. 4) also mentions, pragmatics gives us the ability to use language in variation and unconventional ways, as long as we know what we are doing. So we can let ourselves be creative with our words, if there is a reason for it, or if it is done for a purpose. All of this can be achieved because pragmatics focuses on the effect of context on meaning as it approaches to study language's connection with contextual background features. Peccei and Yule (as cited in Cutting, 2002, p. 2) say:

“Pragmatic study the meaning of words in context, analysing the parts of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of the physical and social world, and the socio-psychological factors influencing communication, as well as the knowledge of the time and place in which the words are uttered or written.”

Pragmatics aims to study language in relation with contextual background attributes, and context is understood to cover the identities of participants, the time and place, also the participants' knowledge, beliefs, intentions inside the event of the speech, as part of the context, because context gives the information about the perception of the environment from the utterance.

As an example, friend of two in an interaction may imply something to some others without showing clear linguistic evidence that we can point to as the explicit

source or the utterance with the implied or true meaning behind of what was being tried to be communicated.

*Example of interaction:*

*A: So, do you?*

*B: Yes, I do!*

From the conversation above, how people can understand each other by such simple sentence or utterance, that could only be mean that there is an implied message of what they know in mind. (Yule, 1996, p. 5)

## **2.2 Speech Act Theory**

A speech act is a minimal functional unit in human communications. It refers to all the functions performed through speaking or speech, and all the things done when spoken. That is, when we speak, we perform acts. These include giving reports, making statements, making promises and soon. In brief, speech acts can be considered as a unit of function done or performed through utterances or speech. Speech acts theory attempts to explain how the speakers use language to accomplish intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning what is said. Speech acts are verbal actions happening in the world (Mey, 1993, p. 95).

The process of encoding or decoding speech acts, is that we must know the addressee's trait and culture to apply speech act properly. Mey (1993, p. 139) says that one should not believe a speech act to happen before considering or create the proper context. Whenever the speaker makes an utterance with certain intentions relating to the context, the performer of the utterance performs one or more illocutionary acts.

When someone is attempting to express themselves, people do not only generate utterances that contains grammatical structure and words, but also perform the actions by those utterances. Yule (1996, p. 47) states, demonstrating actions by utterances are called speech act in general. The speaker usually expects the intention in their utterance, or communication, will be recognized by the addressee. Both the speaker and the addressee are usually helped in this process by the circumstances, including other utterances, are called the speech event. It is the nature of the speech

event that determines the interpretation of an utterance as performing a particular speech act. Examples:

*1. You're insane!*

*2. No problem.*

From the models above, text number 1 can show the expression of astonished, whilst text number 2 can express the acknowledgement of gratitude depending on the intention. Speech acts theory defines the projection of the real intention in an utterance. Mey (1993, p. 95) stated, speech acts are verbal actions happening in the world. On the other hand, Yule (1996, p. 47) also mentioned that speech act is actions performed by utterances. Expressing a speech acts, means that we do something with the words in the utterances we used. In other words, it can be performing activity that bring a change as the result from the utterances that we heard.

The speech act theory has three aspects of forming communication, these concepts are locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Yule (1996, p. 48) explains that locutionary act is the base performance of making an utterance. It is simply what has been said. Illocutionary act is the meaning behind the utterance. And then there is what is called perlocutionary act where the result after making an utterance is shown by action or behaviour of the interlocutor. People who are engaged in speech act, dialogue or conversation are called an interlocutor. These three speech acts (locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act) are parts of creating an utterance in a communication. Especially for the illocutionary act, it is where the implied action and meaning can be found in an utterance.

### **2.2.1 Illocutionary Act**

The illocutionary act is what the intention of the speaker implied in the utterance such as to question, making a statement, request, promise, giving a command, threaten, greet, warn, invite, congratulate and many other things. This type of speech act can be quoted as the act of doing something. Illocutionary acts are considered as core theory of speech acts. The illocutionary acts is committed by generating an utterance along with

the intentions behind the words that are uttered and depend on the circumstance. Yule (1996, p. 48) claims, the illocutionary act is made by the communicative force of an utterance known as the illocutionary force of the utterance. In order to interpret the illocutionary act performed by the speaker, it is necessary for the hearer to be familiar with the context in the speech act that occurs. Example:

*“Open fire!”*

The example above has an indication that, let say the speaker is an officer, urges his/her colleague to shoot a visible target, usually with a firearm, to reciprocate with a dangerous attackers. Another example:

*“Can you do me a favour? My hands are dirty.”*

The above example is not entirely projecting an information to the listener that the speaker's hand is dirty. Moreover, the speaker wants the addressee to do an action related to the dirty hand. The speaker might be asking for a tissue, or maybe the speaker needs the listener handling an action for a moment so the speaker could clean his or her hand. Meanings implied behind the utterances is dependent on the context.

### **2.2.2 Five Types of Illocutionary Acts**

There are five classifications of illocutionary acts that the speakers may implied in their utterances. Searle (cited in Levinson, 1983, p. 240) argues that there are five types of actions that one can perform in speaking:

- 1) **Assertive:** The speaker commits to the truth of the expressed proposition. The speaker acts by conveying a belief or claims that something is true or false such as stating, describing, concluding, clarifying, complaining, and reporting. For example, "It's raining outside."
- 2) **Directive:** The speaker attempts to get the addressee to do something. Such actions as requesting, ordering, questioning, suggesting, convincing, and advising. For example, "Please close the door."

- 3) **Commissive:** The speaker commits to doing something in the future. Those actions are such as promising, threatening, offering, and refusing. Example, "I promise to be there on time."
- 4) **Expressive:** The speaker expresses their attitude, such as an emotion, a feeling, or an opinion, which express a psychological state. Such actions are thanking, welcoming, congratulating, apologizing, wishing, praising, and blaming. For example, "I'm sorry for your loss."
- 5) **Declarative:** The speaker changes the world by making an action of declaring, performing, christening, and pronouncing. Such actions are marrying, declaring war, excommunicating, christening a ship, pronouncing someone guilty, firing (from employment), and nominating. For example, "I now pronounce you husband and wife."

### 2.3 The Big Five Personality Model

A person's personality traits can be revealed from the way people use language in different situations which is how context affects the meaning of language. According to Buss and Craik (cited in Spitzley et al., 2022, p. 3), when a person engages an action they signal a trait. The five personality traits, also known as The Big Five, encompass various traits and relate many characteristics into one unified factor. Ackerman (2017, para. 50) explained the five personality traits, the Big Five or Five Factor Model, are divided into five categories abbreviated as OCEAN. Those are namely:

#### 2.3.1 Openness

Openness refers to an individual's level of imagination, creativity, and curiosity. Those are people who tend to be more open-minded, unconventional, and willing to try new things. Openness is dealing with general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination and curiosity while low openness is characterized by conservative people.

Ackerman (2017, para. 53) claims there are common traits that related to openness, those are: imagination, insightfulness, varied interests,

originality, daringness, preference for variety, cleverness, creativity, curiosity, perceptiveness, intellect, and complexity/depth.

### **2.3.2 Conscientiousness**

Conscientiousness refers to an individual's level of self-discipline, responsibility, and dependability. Those are people who tend to be more organized, reliable, and goal-oriented. High conscientiousness is one of traits that tends to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement while low conscientiousness is the tendency to be careless and indifferent.

Ackerman (2017, para. 57) claims there are common traits that related to conscientiousness, those are: persistence, ambition, thoroughness, self-discipline, consistency, predictability, control, reliability, resourcefulness, hard work, energy, perseverance, and planning.

### **2.3.3 Extraversion**

Extraversion refers to an individual's level of social energy, assertiveness, and sociability. Those are people who tend to be more outgoing, talkative, and confident. High extraversion tends to have positive emotions, urgency, the tendency to seek out stimulation while low extraversion is characterized by lack the social exuberance and activity levels of extroverts.

Ackerman (2017, para. 62) claims there are common traits that related to extraversion, those are: sociableness, assertiveness, merriness, outgoing nature, energy, talkativeness, ability to be articulate, fun-loving nature, tendency for affection, friendliness, and social confidence.

### **2.3.4 Agreeableness**

Agreeableness refers to an individual's level of warmth, empathy, and cooperation. Those are people who tend to be more friendly, compassionate, and accommodating. High agreeableness is dealing with the tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others as in case of low agreeableness.



Ackerman (2017, para. 66) claims there are common traits that related to agreeableness, those are: altruism, trust, modesty, humbleness, patience, moderation, tact, politeness, kindness, loyalty, unselfishness, helpfulness, sensitivity, amiability, cheerfulness, and consideration.

### **2.3.5 Neuroticism**

Neuroticism refers to an individual's level of emotional instability, anxiety, and vulnerability. Those are people who tend to be more prone to negative emotions, stress, and self-doubt. High neuroticism is related to experience negative emotion, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability, or is reversed and referred to as emotional stability.

Ackerman (2017, para. 70) claims there are common traits that related to neuroticism, those are: awkwardness, pessimism, moodiness, jealousy, testiness, fear, nervousness, anxiety, timidity, wariness, self-criticism, lack of confidence, insecurity, instability, and oversensitivity.

## **2.4 Previous Related Studies**

Before getting into the analysis focuses on illocutionary acts of the characters in *Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark* movie script, there are several previous studies related to this study will be discussed. These researches are needed in order to understand the illocutionary acts before I conduct this study.

The first study is “The Types of Illocutionary Acts on The Hackerman’s Utterances in *Cyberbully* Movie” by Zulfa (2018). This study aims to explain the types of illocutionary acts to find specific function and statement reflected from the utterances of the character Hackerman depicted in the movie *Cyberbully*. The researcher found the most used type of illocutionary acts from the Hackerman’s utterance is directives in 33 data and assertive through 21 data, while the lowest is commissive for 1 data.

The second study is “Illocutionary Act in the Main Characters’ Utterance in *Mirror Mirror* Movie” by Rahayu, et al, (2018). This study aims to research Searle’s types of illocutionary act of the main characters’ utterance and by Hymes’ SPEAKING model to look for the context that affect the illocutionary act of the

main characters in *Mirror Mirror* movie. This research shows that of the total 55 illocutionary act they found 4 representatives, 37 directives, 0 declaratives, 2 commissives, and 12 expressives. Directives is the most frequent types of illocutionary act found in the data, whereas there were eight factors from the context of Hymes' SPEAKING model affecting the main character's illocutionary act, they are setting, participants, ends, act, sequences, key, instrumentalities and genre.

The last study is "An Analysis of Illocutionary Act in *Prince of Persia: The Sands of Time* Movie" by Wardani (2011). This study aims to find the context and classification of illocutionary acts used by Dastan as the main character in the movie *Prince of Persia: The Sand of Time*. The writer found five types of illocutionary acts by the main character. Those illocutionary acts are representative (such as, stating, reporting, and concluding), directive (such as, asking, ordering, requesting, and commanding), expressive (such as, apologising, and praising), commissive (such as, refusing, and pledging), and declarative (such as, declaring).

The similarity between my study and those mentioned studies is that we study the same thing; illocutionary act, the five types of illocutionary acts and the main theory that we use to analyze the data is Searle's theory. The difference between these studies with my research is the object of the research. The first study used "The Types of Illocutionary Acts on The Hackerman's Utterances in Cyberbully Movie," the second study used "Illocutionary Act in the Main Characters' Utterance in *Mirror Mirror* Movie," and the third study used "An Analysis of Illocutionary Act in *Prince of Persia: The Sands of Time* Movie." As for in my study, I used "Illocutionary Acts in *Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark* (2019) Movie Script." The novelty that I will do in my study compared to the three previous studies above is that I will analyse the types of illocutionary acts in the main character's utterance and descriptions of personality found in the utterance of the main character in *Scary Stories to Tell in the Dark* movie script.