CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter the writer discusses deeply about the relevant theories which are pragmatic, speech act and the types, illocutionary act, directive illocutionary act, the syntactic realization, and previous studies.

2.1   Pragmatics

Sometimes people who want to say something has a hidden meaning and a specific purpose. Therefore, humans need more knowledge to learn the meaning of the words spoken by the speaker or writer to the listener or reader. As Yule (1996, p.3) points out in identifying the pragmatic "pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)." While this pragmatic can increase the sensitivity of hearer or listener in order to understand the request made by the speaker in accordance with who they are talking to, where they are talking to, when they are talking, and under what circumstances they are talking. In pragmatics, there are several explanations or types are used to analyze a speech from the speaker to the listener. Besides, another

explanation in Yule's book (1996, p.3) there are four pragmatic definitions which are "*Pragmatic is the study of speaker meaning, pragmatic is the study of contextual meaning, Pragmatic is the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and Pragmatic is the study of the expression of relative distance*". From this understanding, it can be concluded that pragmatics are not only studying a study about certain meanings but broadly meaning in understanding the context of the speaker, the meaning of the context, how to get more meaning from the communication than it said, and how to understand the meaning which even has the expression tend to be much different.

According to Yule in his book's (1996, p.9) there are several explanations of pragmatics which are deixis and distance, reference and inference, presupposition and entailment, corporation and implicature, speech act and events, politeness and interaction, conservation and preference structure, discourse, and culture. Here the writer also explains the speech acts theory which is used to analyze this research.

2.2 Speech act and the types

Every action performed is generally carried out on the basis of a person's utterance. Yule (1996, p.47) explains about the action that performed via utterances are generally called speech act, for examples such as an apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, or request. So in the theory of speech act, generally an utterance that is happening in a conversation is not only meant as a statement but has the function and purpose to do something too. For example in Yule (1996):

(2.1) A: *this tea is too bitter huh?*

In the example (2.1), this sentence seems to indicate how speaker A saying something about his tea which is too bitter, whereas in speech act theory, the meaning of the sentence can be something else, for example, the speaker saying something about his tea also asking to get the sugar to be sweeter.

Noted in the discourse analysis lecture handout by Chojimah (2015, p.46) from Austin (1975), explained that in speech act theory there are constatives (truth and falsity) and performatives (assessable from their felicity), and Austin (1975) concludes that the dichotomy between performatives and constatives is not relevant since empirical data prove that all utterances perform specific actions even though the literally do not reflect actions as cited by Chojimah (2015, p. 50). So she mentions that in saying something one show three acts which are:

A. Locutionary act or locution   :   the literal meaning of the utterance.

B. Illocutionary act or illocution   :   the action behind the utterance, such as making statements, disagreeing, promising, and others.

C. Perlocutionary act or perlocution   :   the impact of the illocution where the perlocutionary is the effect of the action that occurs behind the utterances.

So in this research, the writer focuses on one act types of speech act which is the illocutionary act.

2.3   Illocutionary act or illocution

As has been mentioned in the background study, sometimes when someone says something is not just uttering something but also has a certain purpose where there is an action behind the speech itself, this is called as illocutionary act. According to Yule (1996, p.53), there are five classifications of Illocutionary act one of which can be used at the time of speech act.

The five types are as follows:

2.3.1   **Declarations** are those kinds of speech acts which can change a thing in life activity through a phrase that has been expressed. In this type, a speaker usually has a special institutional role as this is commonly done, to declare things properly and appropriately. For example, in the example given by Yule as below:

   a. Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.

   b. Jury Foreman: We find the defendant guilty.

2.3.2   **Representatives** are those kinds of speech act by a speaker who believes in his or her own perspective becomes the case or not. Statements such as descriptions, assertions, and conclusions, as in the following examples:

   a. The earth is flat.

   b. It was a hot sunny day.

2.3.3   **Expressive** are those kinds of speech acts which are expressed through what the speaker feels. A psychological expression of a person expressed

as joy, pain, bitterness, joy, sorrow. This can be caused by the speaker or the hearer experiences.

a. *Please accept my condolences!*

b. *Congratulations!*

2.3.4 **Directives** are those kinds of speech acts which are used by the speaker that directed to the hearer to do something; they do what the speakers want.

a. *Please return my book*

b. *Don't touch that.*

2.3.5 **Commisives** are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use commit themselves to what the speakers will do in the future.

a. *I'll be back*

b. *We will not do that*

2.4   Directive illocution

Like what has been expressed by Yule (1996) about speech act, where there are several types that describe a speech act. The writer focuses on the material function of the directive illocutionary act. It almost seems like Searle theories in classifications of directive illocutionary which are representatives, directives, commissives, expressive declarative. The writer focuses on a classification of directive illocution. Here the writer also finds a list of the directive illocutionary act by Vandervaken (1990). According to Vanderveken (1990, p.189) In his list of

directive illocutionary act contains : *direct, request, ask, question, inquire, interrogate, urge, encourage, discourage, solicit, appeal, petition, invite, convene, convoke, beg, supplicate, beseech, implore, entreat, conjure, pray, insist, tell, instruct, demand, require, claim, order, command, dictate, prescribe, enjoin, adjure, exorcise, forbid, prohibit, interdict, proscribe, commission, charge, suggest, purpose, warn, advise, caution, alert, alarm, recommend, permit, allow, authorize, consent, invoke, imprecate, and intercede.*, it mentioned that there are 56 lists of directives act in his theory. In this research, the writer only uses 5 types of directives illocutionary act which are use the theory by Vandervaken (1990) that appropriate with the context of the movie. The reasons the writer uses only 5 types of directive illocutionary are that the writer saw some aspects of language that are often used in colloquial languages, such as requesting, asking, suggest something, prohibit, warn. And also to make brief explanation aimed to more focused, detailed, and not too much data being used.

2.4.1   Requesting

A request is a directives illocutionary act that allows the option of refusal. Usually, it uses a modifier "please".

Example: *Would you like to drink this coffee, **please?***

*Could you bring some shirt for me**, please?***

2.4.2 Asking

There are three special cases of the questioning use of asking according to Vandervaken (1990) which are question, inquire, and interrogate. To question is to ask for an answer, to inquire is to question something with the expectation of an answer that is assertive, and to interrogate is similar to question people formally with the allegation that it aims to gain an important point.

Example: *How can I help your Mom?*

Where are you now? I need your help

2.4.3 Prohibiting

Prohibit is the type of directive illocutionary act that tends to prohibit an action, not only now but also more generally and over a longer period of time (special propositional content conditions).

Example: *Don't waste your time and money!*

Don't trust him!

2.4.4 Suggesting

Suggesting is a type of directive illocutionary act that applies suggesting someone to do something better, it also to propose that a hearer can carry out some action and is to suggest that he accept doing that action.

Example: *I advise you not* to believe what you read in this article.

2.4.5 Warning

A warning is a type of directive illocutionary act that is to warn and advise someone to do it. It would be better if executed appropriately, then there will be a presumption that something bad will happen if not implemented.

Example: *I will warn you not to wait for me if I cannot come earlier.*

2.5 Syntactic Realization

The use of syntactic realization in this study is to find the second study problems. It is to find the meaning of the sentences that found from the data related to the directive act. By using the theory of syntactic realization, the writer can find the meaning of the type in directive illocution act that corresponds to the speaker's spoken intent. So the syntactic realization is to identify the intended meaning of an utterance. As Yule (1996, p.48) explains in the conversation you are doing an action using a spoken language, for example promise, complain, apologize, and warning. He explains that there is a direct and indirect speech act in a conversation, in a simple way there is structural distinction between three basic sentence types, which are three general types of speech acts provided, through three basic sentence type*s* (Declarative, Interrogative, and imperative) and three common communication functions (Statement, question, command/request). Whenever a direct relationship between a structure and function is called as a direct speech act, and whenever the

indirect relationship between a structure and a function is called an indirect speech act.

2.5.1 Declarative structures

A declarative structure is a type of sentence that is usually used to create a statement or to declare something. Yule (1996, p.55) believes in speech act a declarative used to make a statement is a direct speech act, but a declarative used to make a request is an indirect speech act.

Example:

a. *It's cold outside. (Declarative statement)*

b. *I hereby tell you about the weather. (Direct)*

c. *I hereby request of you that you close the door. (Indirect)*

When it is used to make a statement as sentence number (a) it can be called as a direct speech act, while when it is used to make a request for sentence number c. It can be called an indirect speech act.

2.5.2 Interrogative structures

A type of sentence that aims to ask and usually use a question mark, in the following example the use of interrogative structures below is not only used as a form of common questions (direct speech act) but as a form of indirect speech act.

Example: *Do you have to stand in front of the TV?*

It means to ask someone not to stands in front of the TV so she/her must to move from the place.

2.5.3 Imperative structures

A type of sentence used to create a command, request, or direction form is called imperative structures. In the example of the sentence (A) below, it is a type of direct speech act sentence. However in reality, it could be an indirect speech act sentence, this can be seen depending on the situation when/where the utterance is performed.

Example*:*

A: **shut up** *the Window!*

2.6 Previous Studies

To support this study and in order to complete the analysis well, the writer used several previous studies that try to improve and distinguish the research that is related to phenomena in the speech act. There are two previous studies that the writer reviewed.

The first is the journal by Tesaindra, Muhammad Salman (2017) Volume 6 number 2 Diponegoro University entitled The Directive illocutionary act in Help Movie. The result of the analysis shows that there are 5 types of directive illocutionary act found in the movie "The Help" which are request, command,

prohibit, warn, and pray. In the analysis, there is also direct and indirect speech act. Next, factors that affect the speaker in using indirect speech act are an effort in getting something from the other person who has higher power

The second study is conductedby Lisa (2017) entitled *Tindak tutur direktif dalam Film La Belle et La Bête Karya Christophe Gans Tahun 2014.* The writer took the utterances of the Film La Belle et LA *Bête by Christophe Gans 2014. S*he tried to analyze the types function in directive speech act that found by the interaction of meaning and the shape of it. The result of the research is that she found 42 utterances that contain directive speech act, namely 26 directs, 3 orders, 8 requests, and 5 suggestions. The conclusion of this research in the film is that the actor and actress often used directive speech act.

The third study is by Vurkuna (2016) entitled *Illocutionary Acts in Ridwan Kamil's Speech Entitled Creativity and Design for Social Change in Cities in TEDx Event in Jakarta in 2010,* the data taken from the speech uttered by Ridwan Kamil. Vurkuna tried to analyze the types of illocutionary act and the syntactical realizations of illocutionary acts performed by Ridwan Kamil. She used the theory of Searle (1979) and Biber *et al* (2002) to analyze the data.

Based on the previous studies the writer is interested in analyzing more deeply about the illocutionary act, especially about the directive illocutionary act like what has been analyzed in the journal by Tesaindra, Muhammad Salman (2017). In the research object data, the first and the second research used the movie as the data and the second research used speech by a famous person in Indonesia as a speaker

motivator, while the present researcher uses the speaker character utterances in the movie animation. So in this study, the writer collected three different ways from the three previous studies to create a new and complete research.

The writer wants to analyze the data using the theory from Vanderveken (1990) to find the directive illocutionary act and Yule (1996) in analyzing the context of syntactically realized to find the intended meaning of the directive illocutionary act, but in the second previous study the researcher used the theory by Bieber *et el* (2002) to identify the syntactically realized while the present researcher used the theory from Yule (1996) in order to make it more widely because that linguistics aspect is commonly having the same perspective in explaining the various theory of speech act.