CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

To support the analysis, this chapter reviews on several theories related to this research. Those are pragmatics, speech acts, Searle's illocutionary acts taxonomy, representative illocutionary acts, performative verb, context of situation and related studies.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics which studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. Such a scope for pragmatics would include the study of deixis, presupposition and speech acts.

There are several advantages of studying language via pragmatics that is people can talk about people's intended meaning, people's assumptions, purpose or goal, and the kinds of actions that they are performing when they speak.

Then, according to Yule (1996: 3) pragmatics is the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It means that pragmatically focused on what of speaker meaning. This involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstances. Meanwhile, according to Levinson (1983: 5), pragmatics is the study of language use, that is, the study of the relation between language and context

8

that are basic to an account of language understanding. In this case, language understanding means that understanding an utterance involves the making of inferences that will connect what is said to what is mutually assumed or what has been said before.

In Yule's examples (1996: 47-48) show a different interpretation from single sentence as performing a perticular speech act. The interpretation is based on the different context of utterance:

This tea is really cold!

a) On a winter day, the speaker reaches for a cup of tea, believing that it has been freshly made, takes a sip, then produce that utterance above. That sentence can be interpreted as a complaint.

b) On a hot summer day, the speaker is being given a glass of iced tea by the hearer, taking a sip and producing that utterance above. It is likely to be interpreted as praise.

In short, pragmatics analyzes the certain utterance in certain situation. It is concerned with how people use language within a context and why they use language in particular ways.

2.2 Definition of Speech Acts

The central concern of pragmatics is speech acts. A speech act is a part of pragmatic discussion which relates to what a certain sentence and utterance possesses certain act within it. Speech acts are used in communication to express a certain attitude. For example, a statement expresses a belief.

Further, Austin in Joan Cutting (2002: 16) said speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. Then, Yule (1996: 47) also defined speech acts as an action performed via utterances. This is because when people express themselves in communication, they do not only produce an utterance which contains grammatical structure of words and sentence. They also perform actions via their utterances.

Then, Searle in Nihat Bayat (2013: 214) also highlights that the speech act is presented in real language use situations. He stated that the basic assumption of the speech act theory should be the smallest unit in human communication which is an implementation of certain types of acts, such as making statements, asking question, or making promises.

2.3   Speech Acts Classification

According to Austin in Yule (1996: 48), the action performed by producing an utterance consists of three distinct levels. He distinguishes the act *of* saying something, what one does *in* saying it, and what one does *by* saying it, and dubs these a *locutionary,* an *illocutionary*, and a *perlocutionary* act. Those will be explained more detail as follows:

a)   **Locutionary**

Locutionary Act, which is also known as utterance act, is the actual form of words or the literal meaning of a sentence. Thus, locutionary acts can be viewed as a mere uttering of some words in certain language. Further, Yule

(1996: 48) asserts this kind of act as the basic act of utterances of producing a meaningful linguistic expression.

b) **Illocutionary**

Illocutionary act is an act performed in saying something. Thus, the illocutionary act, namely the act of doing something. In other word, it can be said that illocutionary acts communicates the speaker's intension behind the locution, example: stating, questioning, promising, requesting and many others.

For example: *Did Jennifer get an A on the test?*

The sentence above shows that the speaker performed the act of asking a question to hearer whether Jennifer get A on her test. Thus, it belongs to illocutionary acts.

c) **Perlocutionary**

A perlocutionary act reveals the effect the speaker wants to exercise over the hearer. Thus, a perlocutionary act is said to be effective if it produces an effects upon their though, feeling, and action of the hearer. For example:

Would you close the door, please?

The surface form, and also the locutionary act, of this utterance is a question with a clear content (Close the door.) The illocutionary act conveys a request from the part of the speaker and the perlocutionary act expresses the speaker's desire that the hearer should go and close the door. Thus, the perlucutionary act is successful if the hearer recognize that he should close the door, but as a perlocutionary act it succeeds only if he actually close it

2.4 Searle's Illocutionary Acts Classification

The speech act theory put forward by Austin and his student Searle. Austin stated that speech acts are focused on the relationship between language and actions. Then, he divided illocutionary acts into five groups: verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behabitives and expositives. This classification is based on their illocutionary force. However, it is criticized by Searle. He said that Austin's classification is not for illocutionary acts, but English illocutionary verbs. Thus, Austin's theory was revised and developed further by Searle. According to Searle, there are five categories of illocutionary acts. Those are:

a. **Representatives:** are utterance in which the speaker fits his words to the world and which incorporates his belief in what she/he speaks. (E.g. asserting, concluding, describing, claiming, hypothesizing, swearing, suggesting predicting, and some other acts.

For examples: The name of Abigail's father is Callaghan.

b. **Directives:** are attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something. (E.g. requesting, questioning, inviting, forbidding, ordering, challenging and some others acts.)

For examples: Would you make me a glass of milk, please?

c. **Commissives:** commit the speaker to some future course of action (E.g. promising, threatening, offering, refusing, vowing, volunteering and some other acts).

For examples: I promise to came at eight and cook a nice dinner for you.

d. **Expressive:** are the acts which express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content (e.g. thanking, apologizing, welcoming, congratulating, greeting and some other acts)

For examples: Thank you for your kind offer.

e. **Declarations:** the acts containing utterance that can alter the world (e.g. abbreviating, naming, calling, christening and some other acts)

For examples: I baptize you Jennifer Abigail Callaghan.

Those theories above help to support and complete the main theory, to answer statement problems.

2.5 Representative Illocutionary Acts

According to Yule (1996: 53), representative is those kind of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Kreidler (1998: 183) also adds that in the assertive function speakers and writers use language to tell what they know or believe; assertive language is concerned with facts. The purpose is to inform. By performing an assertive or representative, the speaker makes the words fit the world (belief). See for Examples:

1. *The name of British queen is Elizabeth.*

2. *The earth is flat.*

The two examples represent the world's events as what the speaker believes. Example (1) implies the speaker's assertion that the British queen's name is

Elizabeth. In example (2) the speaker asserts that he/she believes that the earth is flat.

Paradigm cases of representative such as: asserting, concluding, describing, claiming, hypothesizing, swearing, suggesting predicting, reporting, telling, insisting, swearing, suggesting, believing, explaining, convincing, affirming, announcing, forecasting, and etc. This is examples of representative illocutionary acts in sentences:

a. *I certainly don't agree with his assertion that men are better drivers than women.* (Asserting)

b. *At first I thought he was a bit shy, but I've come to the conclusion that he's simply unfriendly.* (Concluding)

c. *This was a messy and dark room.* (Describing)

d. *It is not responsible for the pollution in the river.* (Claiming)

e. *There's no point hypothesizing about how the accident happened, since we'll never really know.* (Hypothesizing)

f. *It is difficult to predict how the anger and frustration will express itself.* (predicting)

g. *I swear Miss, I have submitted my essay today.* (Swearing)

h. *Etc..,*

Thus, the present study is focusing to analyze representative illocutionary acts in Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tales. That topic is chosen in order to get a deeper understanding about representative.

In other side, by analyzing representative illocutionary acts, it also teaches about telling a truth in our speaking. This can be reflected from the definition of representative illocutionary acts itself, which commits the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. Moreover, in noble Quran, there is an order to always tell the truth when we are speaking. This is *Al-Baqarah,* verse 42. It shows about order to tell truthfulness:

وَلَا تَلْبِسُوا۟ٱلْحَقَّ بِٱلْبَٰطِلِ وَتَكْتُمُوا۟ٱلْحَقَّ وَأَنتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ ﴿٤٢﴾

And do not mix the truth with falsehood or conceal the truth while you know [it]. (Quran.com, 2015).

From the Quran verse above, we can take a lesson that saying a truthfulness is very important. It can bring a happiness in our life. This value also can be gotten from representative Illocutionary acts which is reflected to tell the truth or what he/she believes without any falsehood.

Those theories above help to support and complete the main theory, especially in finding the paradigm case of representative illocutionary act.

2.6   Performative Verb

According to Austin in Wardhaugh (1992: 283) instead of saying something a speaker may be doing something or be performing an action by using performative. Thus, he defines performative as an utterance which contains a special type of verb (a performative verb) by force of which it performs an action. Austin further claims that from the grammatical point of view, a performative is a

first person indicative active sentence in the simple present tense. It is because the illocutionary act is being performed and denominated at the moment of utterance. For examples:

a. *I assert that Jenny got an A on the test.*

b. *I ask you who took the photos.*

c. *I order you to close the window.*

However, that criterion above is ambiguous though and that is why, in order to distinguish the performative use from other possible uses of first person indicative active pattern, Austin introduces a hereby test since he finds out that performative verbs only can collocate with this adverb.

A test of whether or not a particular sentence is a performative utterance is whether or not you can insert hereby before the verb. If the resulting sentence doesn't make sense, it is not a performative:

a. *I hereby name this ship Sojourner; but*

b. **I hereby named this ship Sojourner.   (incorrect)*

Having defined performatives, Austin then draws a basic distinction between them. He distinguishes two general groups - explicit and implicit performatives. According to Lyons (1981: 175), an explicit performative is one in which the utterance inscription contains an expression that makes explicit what kind of act is being performed. In simple definition, it means that explicit performative verb (a speech act containing a performative verb) and implicit performative verb (a speech act without a performative verb).

Those theories above help to support and complete the theory, especially in finding the paradigm case of representative illocutionary act.

2.7   Context of Situation

When language is used, it is always used in a context. How and what gets said is always part of a variety of contextual factors. Therefore, analyzing the meaning of an utterance cannot ignore the context since the meaning of an utterance will be different if the context is different.

According to Leech (1983: 13), context is background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer which contributes to hearer's interpretation of what the speaker means by given utterance. Then, context also plays important role in understanding what one says. Context may help people in understanding the particular meaning of words, phrases, and so on. Thus, it becomes important to know the context of speech.

Further, Hymes (1974: 55-60) puts forward several concepts for describing the context of situation. For convenience, he uses the word SPEAKING as an acronym for the various factors he deems to be relevant.

- **(S) Setting and Scene**

Setting refers to the time and place, i.e. the concrete physical circumstances in which a speech event takes place. Scene refers to the abstract psychological setting, or the cultural definition of the occasion, including characteristics such as range of formality and sense of play or seriousness.

- **(P) Participants**

Participants are ones who are speaking and to whom they are speaking to. They include speaker and listener, addressor-addressee, or sender-receiver. The social factors, such as age, gender, status, social distance, and role or profession of the participants have to be considered as well.

- **(E) End**

End refers to the conventionally recognized and expected outcomes of an exchange as well as the personal goals that participants seek to accomplish on particular occasions. In other words, it refers to the purpose, goal, and outcomes of a speech event.

- **(A) Act Sequence**

Act refers to the actual form and content of what is said the precise words used, how they are used, and the relationship of what is said with the actual topic at hand.

- **(K) Key**

Key refers to the cues that establish the tone, manner, or in which a particular message is conveyed: light-hearted, serious, precise, sarcastic, and so on. Key may also be marked nonverbally by certain kinds of behavior, gesture, posture, or even deportment.

- **(I) Instrumentalities**

Instrumentalities basically refer to the choice of channel and the actual forms of speech employed, such as the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen. The choice of channel itself can be oral, written, or telegraphic.

- **(N) Norm of Interaction and Interpretation**

This factor refers to the specific behaviors and properties attached to speaking and also to how these may be viewed by someone who does not share them, e.g. loudness, silence, and gaze return. In simpler words, norms here are social rules governing the event and the participants' action and reaction.

- **(G) Genre**

Genre refers to the clearly demarcated types of utterance, such as poem, proverb, riddles, sermon, prayer, lecturer, and editorial.

However, sometimes, it is hard to find all elements of the context of situation in analyzing an utterance because not every utterance has them. Therefore, only some of them are used or considered in interpreting an utterance. In addition to context of situation, Holmes (2001: 8) states that in any situation, linguistic choices will generally reflect the influence of one or more of the following components:

a) **The participants:** who is speaking and whom he is speaking to,

b) **The setting or social context of interaction:** where they are speaking (physical setting) and what psychological situation in which they are speaking (psychological setting),

c) **The topic:** what is being talked about,

d) **The function:** why they are speaking.

According to the above quotations, the first important thing in a situational context is a participant. Holmes says that in a certain social context, there will be a certain social factor related to the "participant" who is involved in a certain conversation. It concerns the speaker who is talking to whom. The next component

is called as the "setting". This term deals with the place where the conversation takes place and in what kind of situation both speakers and hearers are involved in. The third component is the "topic". It is about something that is talked about, without which the conversation cannot happen. The last factor is the "function". It focuses on the reason why both speaker and the hearer decide to talk about a certain topic in certain settings.

Furthermore, the researcher uses the context of the situation in order to explain why certain representative illocutionary acts have been said on a particular occasion in the story.

2.8 Related Studies

Recently, the study of speech acts has been popular. Numerous studies about speech acts have been conducted by researchers using various sources of data. The previous studies below mostly talk about the use of illocutionary acts with a variety of different research object. Those studies below is used in a variety of media such as novel, movie, political speech, and source from the interview.

2.8.1 Speech Acts on the Miscommunication Between Agus and Rita in Aditya Mulya's Jomblo by Emma Aryndani (2005)

This is a research on the miscommunication that took conversations between Agus and Rita in Aditya Mulya's novel entitled *Jomblo* as its data to be analyzed. The writer intended to reveal the illocution and the perlocution used by Agus and Rita, which can trigger conflict and occur within the conflict itself. Moreover, the writer chose Speech Act theories, especially the illocution and the perlocution

theories, as the main theories. Emma adopted theories or statements from Austin, Searle, Hurford and Heasley, and many other linguists who discuss about the illocution and the perlocution. Moreover, she also used men's and women's language theory from Holmes, Gray and Lakoff.

From the findings she finally found, it is true that when the hearer's illocution does not conform the speaker's perlocution it will cause miscommunication as well. Further, giving (more) explanation, asking the hearer to do something, giving suggestion and her opinion were four kinds of speaker's illocution which can caused conflict as well. It makes sense when asking the hearer to do something causes conflicts. It is because the hearer knows directly how the face of the speaker toward him/her is. The interesting finding is, how can, giving (more) explanation, giving suggestion and giving his/her opinion can cause conflict. Meanwhile, giving (more) explanation usually uses to make something clearer and giving suggestion usually uses to suggest someone to be better. It seems that those acts or illocution were not well accepted by the hearer and this can cause another conflict.

From the Emma's research above gave so many inputs to this present study as the writer also analyzed the speech act, especially the illocutionary acts. She also used several same theories, such as the statement from Austin and Searle. It is also used in this present study. Moreover, Emma used the same way for the methodology that is qualitative method. The difference lies in the data in which this study analyzed a fairy tale while the previous study analyzed a novel as her data. Then, the previous study is focused to the specific topic of speech acts on miscommunication between the characters. However, this previous analysis used

the object in Indonesian. That is better to take English object accordance with Emma's major. The example of characters utterance is not translated to English.

2.8.2 Illocutionary Acts of the Persuasion Used by the Main Characters in "Runaway Jury" by Irvan Hadinata (2008)

This is a study about a speech act of persuasion in a movie entitled "Runaway Jury". The writer uses the theory of speech act from Searle, especially persuasion speech acts. The writer does this study to find the types and percentages of illocutionary acts occur in the movie. In this research, the writer uses both descriptive qualitative and quantitative approach.

Based on the data analysis, the writer found that persuasion of the main characters take the functions illocutionary acts in the movie. In this research, Commisives (49%) is the most dominant type used by the characters on the runaway jury movie. Next, is representatives (29 %) and last one is directives (21%). Last, the writer founds that the types of illocutionary which mostly occur in the movie is assuring, stating, and advising. From the findings above, the writer may conclude that illocutionary acts is an important tool as in human's interaction because when people say something, it convey a force.

This research gave so many inputs to this study as the writer also analyzed the speech act, especially the illocutionary acts. He also used several same theories in this study, such as the theory of illocutionary acts classifying by Searle. The difference lies in the data in which this study analyzed a written text while the previous study analyzed a movie as his data.

2.8.3 An Experimental Study of the Classification and Recognition of Chinese Speech Acts by Si Liu (2011)

This study examines how Chinese speakers categorize speech acts and whether their utterance comprehension involves speech act recognition. Moreover, this previous study referring to the methods of Holtgraves (2005). He examined the psychological reality of Searle's speech act classification. He found that English speakers tended to group speech acts in terms of their underlying emotional valence (a perlocutionary effect) rather than by their illocutionary points, which is how Searle classifies speech acts. Then, Holtgraves and Ashley (2001) claimed that utterance comprehension involves speech act recognition.

Experiments 1 and 2 allowed participants to classify speech acts using their own criteria. The findings showed that participants categorized speech acts based upon perlocutionary effects, which is consistent with the claim made by Holtgraves, rather than illocutionary points, as Searle proposed. The second issue tested in Experiments 3 and 4 concerned the recognition of speech acts. The results obtained from Experiment 3 corresponded to the finding by Holtgraves and Ashley: Chinese participants recognized the illocutionary acts when they comprehended the target utterances in contextually specified situations, which supports Gricean theory. Experiment 4 did not provide strong evidence that Chinese speakers recognized the illocutionary act of an utterance when interpreting the utterance online.

From the previous study above, there are several similarities and differences. The difference lied on the object data, the previous study used participant as the data source and the present study used fairy tales. Then the previous study analyzed

how Chinese speakers categorize speech acts and whether their utterance comprehension involves speech act recognition While, the present study focuses on the part of representative illocutionary acts.

2.8.4 *Illocutionary Acts on the Speech of Hillary Clinton: Primary Night Speech* by Andrew Sutjiadi (2011)

This research focuses on the application of the illocutionary act in the speech of Primary Night Speech by Hillary Clinton. The writer presented three statements of the problems: to find the types of illocutionary act which exist in the speech, to find the intended meaning, and to find the most frequent type of illocutionary act which occurred. The theories used to do the research are speech act, illocutionary act, pragmatics, social factor, and intended meaning. By using the descriptive method, the writer described the application of the types of illocutionary acts in each fragment in the speech.

Based on the result, Representative is the most frequent type of illocutionary act, occurring 56.52% out of 100%. This means Hillary tends to state and give her opinion about what she wanted to convey. She stated her arguments and critics on the condition of America. She commented that America needed change in most parts of its sectors. Hillary used Representative more than a half of the speech (56.52%).

Further, Hillary only used Directive for just 5.79% of the total speech. This means that Hillary did not like asking or commanding the American people to do something. She is not a dictator, who always gives orders to her subordinates. She only used Directive for several times when she asked the American people to vote

for her. Hillary used Commissive frequent enough, which is 18.8% of the total fragments. It means that she tends to give future promise for the American people. Hillary gave many promises for the American people if she was elected to be the president. Hillary gave promise to change the health insurance, the infrastructure of America, and so on.

From the previous study above, there are several similarities and differences. The difference lied on the object data, the previous study used political speech text and the present study used fairy tales. Then the previous study analyzed all types of illocutionary acts. While, the present study focuses on the part of representative illocutionary acts.

2.8.5 *Intensifiers in Persian Discourse: Apology and Compliment Speech Acts in Focus by* Samira Ghanbaran, Meisam Rahimi, and Abbas Eslami Rasekh (2014)

This previous study was based on the data gathered through Discourse Completion Test (DCT). Then, their study is an attempt to investigate the proportion by which intensifiers are used in the two speech acts of apology and compliment. More specifically, it tries to investigate how using intensifiers ensures the desirable level of appropriateness for Persian speakers and, generally speaking, why they are used in that proportion. Moreover, it tries to find out whether gender tends to affect the differential degrees of use of intensifiers. To this end, Persian apologetic and compliment utterances were collected through interview.

The findings of this study indicate that Persian speakers tend to use different frequencies of intensifiers across genders. Generally speaking, female speakers

used more intensifiers than male speakers in both apology and compliment speech acts. In apology, male speakers used 44.5 % intensifiers while female speakers used 55.4%. In compliment speech act, females used 58.1 % intensifiers and males used 41.8 %. The t-test showed a significant difference between these two groups.

From the previous study above, there are several similarities and differences. The differences are previous study was based on the data gathered through Discourse Completion Test (DCT) by using interviews and the topic is focused on apology and compliment. The similarity lies in the theory or statement of Austin and Searle about speech acts. However, it is better if this previous study can include other independent factors (e.g. age and level of education) in data analysis.