2.1 The Understanding of Pragmatic

According to Yule (1995: 4), pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication. Pragmatics is about how people understand other’s thought and idea which are expressed through verbal communication.

Furthermore, Mey (1993:42) stated that pragmatics is the study of the conditions of human language uses as these are determined by the context of society. Levinson (1996:21), added that pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. So pragmatics can be defined as a study talking about the relationship between language and context, in which the contextual meaning of an utterance can be different from the grammatical meaning.

From the definition above, we can conclude that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which concerns with language use in context and the study of meaning related to the context or situation. 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
Pragmatics as below:

1) Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning.
2) Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.
3) Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said.
4) Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance.

Basically, pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (writer) and interpreted by a listener (reader). Therefore, pragmatics focuses on what people mean by their utterances might mean by themselves. In other words, pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. The term of pragmatics also focuses on the ability or proficiency to make a use of language that relates with determinant factors of communicative acts. It means pragmatic discussed the structure and the form of language to the context situation and at the same time is closely related to the atmosphere of hearer, speaker and surroundings.

Through pragmatics, one can understand the real meaning of an utterance, the motivation of someone to say something by its relation to the context. Actually, based on the definition of pragmatics, we can explore some understanding about the facts with which pragmatics deals:

1) Facts about the objective facts of the utterance: who the speaker is, when the utterance happened, and where;
2) Facts about the speaker’s intention. What language the speaker intends to use, what meaning he intends to be using.
3) Facts about beliefs of the speaker and those to whom he speaks and what are they talking about.
Pragmatics studies the ability of natural language speakers to communicate more than that which is explicitly stated. Another perspective is that pragmatics deals with the ways we reach our goal in communication. Pragmatics explains language use in context. It seeks to explain aspects of meaning which cannot be found in the plain sense of words or structures, as explained by semantics. As a field of language study, pragmatics is fairly new. Its origins lie in philosophy of language and the American philosophical school of pragmatism. Pragmatics is regarded as one of the most challenging aspects for language learners to grasp, and can only truly be learned with experience.

2.1.1 The Relationship between Pragmatics and Semantics

Semantics and pragmatics are both related to the way meaning is derived from language. Semantics studies the meaning that words and certain combinations of words hold for both the speaker and listener. Pragmatics deals with how the context in which words are used can dictate their true meaning at that particular time. Semantics and pragmatics are closely related as they both are attempts to understand the meaning of language beyond the literal definition of words.

Pragmatics and semantics are two branches of linguistics that discussed the same field namely meaning. Both deal with the meaning of words that uttered by human being in their own language, but it is important to make a clear distinction between them so that there is no more misunderstanding about the study object of the two linguistics’ branches.

Theories of semantics attempt to describe the meaning of words and how they can change in different situations. There is a denotation for every word that is
its direct or literal meaning, but words can also have connotation, or implied meaning. Some words or phrases create a feeling that goes beyond literal meaning.

Pragmatics is a way of looking at how communication goes beyond what is literally said. For instance, if someone speaks with a tone of sarcasm, the overall meaning that is communicated by what they are saying is completely different than what the words alone would mean. People often misunderstand words that are taken out of context. This too is a part of pragmatics, as the meaning that is communicated changes depending on the context in which it is used.

For more understanding about the distinction between pragmatics and semantics, let us see some examples below:

a) “I have no money.”

Semantically, this sentence is a statement to inform that the speaker has no money. But, pragmatically, it is a request. It means that the speaker asks someone as the hearer to treat the speaker.

b) “Don’t make a noise”

Base on semantically, this utterance means, the speaker inform that the hearer so noisy. But, it would means opposite to the semantic meaning when it was happened in the class, when the teacher (speaker) explain the subject, the sentence “Don’t make a noise” means the teacher ask the student to silent.

c) “I like your smile.”
Semantically, this sentence is a statement to inform that the hearer has a pretty smile. But, based on pragmatics, it is a praising. It means that the speaker try to seduce the hearer.

It can be difficult to distinguish between semantics and pragmatics because they cover such similar concepts. Much communication takes place outside of what is literally spoken because connotation, context, and tone all play a part in how words are interpreted. Semantics and pragmatics are both attempts to understand how people process and use these functions of language as part of the overall communication process. Semantics and pragmatics work together to decipher the complex process of communication through language.

2.1.2 Context in Pragmatics

Context and Pragmatics are two influentially interrelated concepts, that context is required to realize language use in pragmatic perspective. Context, as a dynamic environment enables interlocutors to interact in accordance to both persons’ socio-cultural background. In addition, context helps understand factors in producing, and interpreting speech oriented in users.

Linguists consider context in comprehending the meaning of the sentence. In refer to context as an important aspect to interpret meaning. Fillmore (1977:119) quotes, “The task is to determine what we can know about the meaning and context of an utterance given only the knowledge that the utterance has occurred. I find that whenever I notice some sentences in context, I immediately find myself asking what the effect would have been if the context ( who speaks, to whom, what purpose, how a speaker says, when, and where aspects) had been slightly different.” The statement explains that context influences meaning, that when a context changes, meaning may
change as well. The following sentence: “What time is it?” may have different meanings as it relates to different contexts, as follows.

1) The speaker produces interrogative sentence that asks the time to the hearer. The speakers or interlocutors are probably friends who start leaving for campus;

2) The speaker expresses annoyance to a hearer, who probably comes late to an appointment; and

3) the speaker remembers that it’s time for her/him to go home.

As context is one aspect of several related aspects in Pragmatics, one must learn context being at work in speech situation. The speech situation calls for aspects of the followings:

1) Addressers and addressees, speakers (writers) and hearers (readers), which these terms do not restrict pragmatics to the spoken language. Addressers are persons produce utterances, and addressees are persons to whom the utterances are addressed;

2) Context of utterance which includes relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance, which Leech refers to any background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer which contributes to interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance;

3) Goals of utterance, which means function of an utterance which explains the speaker’s intention in producing utterance;

4) The utterance as a form of act or activity called a speech act; and

5) The utterance as a product of a verbal act.

There are four subparts involved in fleshing out what we mean by context:
1) **Physical Context:** Where the conversation takes place, what objects are present and what action are taking place.

2) **Epistemic Context:** The background knowledge shared by the speakers and the hearers.

3) **Linguistic Context:** It is concerned with sentence or utterances preceding a certain sentence utterance in communication event.

4) **Social Context:** Concerned with social relation and setting background that complete the relationship between speakers and hearers.

### 2.1.3 Goals of Pragmatic Theory

Akmajian, 1980 (in Risana, 2005:13) summarizes the minimal requirements on an adequate pragmatics theory as follows:

a). A pragmatic theory must contain a classification of speech acts

b). A pragmatic theory must contain analysis and definitions of various speech acts.

c). A pragmatic theory must contain a specification of various uses of expression, it must be said that :

i. Expression e is standardly (literally and directly) used to do x (in context c).

ii. Expression e has n different uses.

iii. Expression e has e’ have the same use or uses

d). A pragmatic theory must relate literal and direct language use to such phenomena as :

i. Linguistic structure (semantic, syntax, phonology)

ii. The structure of the communication, the course of conversation. And social institution.
iii. Speaker meaning, implication, (pragmatics) presupposition and understanding.

In pursuing these pragmatic goals over the last ten years, there are five disciplines have been interested, they are philosophy, linguistics, psychology, sociology and anthropology (Akmajian (1980). Philosophers have been mainly concerned with the categorizing types of speech acts and defining each category. Linguistics concern with specifying expressions in the language have which uses or conditions on uses. Psychologist has evaluated this investigation of how information concerning language use in processed, store, and acquired. Finally, anthropologist and sociologist concerned with regularities between language use and social role, as well as the structuring of speech acts into conversation, in short, goal.

From the explanation above, we may see that a successful pragmatics will require the cooperation of many disciplines.

2.2 The Overview of Speech Act

2.2.1 Speech Acts

Yule (1996:47) proposes that speech acts is performed action via utterance. Speech act is a theory which analyses the role of utterance in relation to the behavior of speaker and listener in interpersonal communication. In brief when speakers are saying words, they not only produce utterance containing words and grammatical structure, but they also perform action in those utterances.

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. A speech act is the action performed by language to modify the state of the object on which the action is performed.

In order to define performatives, Austin refers to those sentences which conform to the old prejudice in that they are used to describe or constate something, and which thus are true or false; and he calls such sentences "constatives". In contrast to them, Austin (1962:5) defines "performatives" as follows:

1) Performative utterances are not true or false, that is, not truth-evaluable; instead when something is wrong with them then they are "unhappy", while if nothing is wrong they are "happy".

2) The uttering of a performative is, or is part of, the doing of a certain kind of action (Austin later deals with them under the name illocutionary acts), the performance of which, again, would not normally be described as just "saying" or "describing" something.

2.2.2 Types of Speech Acts

Austin in Yule (1996:48) described kinds of acts, they are locutionary act, illocutionary act and Perlocutionary act. As explain below:

1. Locutionary act

Locutionary act is the basic of utterance that is producing a meaningful linguistics expression. In performing a locutionary act, a speaker uses an identifiable expression, consisting of a sentence or fragment of sentence from language.

2. Illocutionary act

Illocutionary act is an act of doing something; it is uttered by the speaker that is not only to say or state something but also it is used to ask someone else to
do something. In utterance, speaker performs an illocutionary act in using a particular locution to refer. Such utterance has illocutionary act force of a statement, a confirming, a denial, a prediction, a promise, a request, etc.

3. Perlocutionary act.

Perlocutionary act is an act that is uttered to affect the listener. An utterance that is uttered by someone often has effect to the listener. Which can be expected or unexpected affect that created by the speaker. So, in other word, a perlocution is listener behavioral response to the meaning of the utterance, not necessarily physical or verbal response, perhaps merely a mental or emotional response.

There is an example of speech acts. A child refuse to lie down and go to sleep, then his mother says, “I’ll turn your light off”. The locutionary act is utterance of this sentence “I’ll turn your light off”. However, the mother may be intending that the utterance to be interpreted as a threat. The threat here is the illocutionary acts. It means that child does not sleep, his mother will turn off the light. As consequence behavior of that child, he must be frightened into silence and sleep is Perlocutionary act.

2.3 Understanding of Illocutionary Act

2.3.1 The Definition of Illocutionary act

This research emphasizes on one of the speech acts, the illocutionary acts. According to Austin in Carrol (1999:140), the illocutionary acts is “the action that is performed by saying the sentence”. However, this research only use the theory of illocutionary act from Searle because the fact that this person has been successful in developing this theory, which is originally from Austin. According to
Hallion(2001:13), to give a better understanding about illocutionary acts, Searle contrast it with Perlocutionary acts. In this explanation, an illocutionary acts “a linguistics acts performed in uttering certain words in a given context” while a Perlocutionary acts is” a non-linguistics act performed as a consequence of performing the locution and illocutionary acts”. For example, the utterance “Good Morning” is the illocutionary acts of greeting, this illocutionary acts effects on the listener’s perception to bring a Perlocutionary acts replying “Good Morning”. In this research, the researcher use illocutionary acts further development.

Illocutionary acts have three important characteristics (Akmajian 1980, in Wahyuni, 2005:18), they are:

1. Illocutionary acts can often be successfully performed simply by uttering the right explicit performative sentence with the right intention and believe and under right circumstances.

2. Illocutionary acts are the central to linguistic communication. Our normal conversations are composed in large part of statements, requesting, ordering, greeting and so forth. The performed acts are governed by rules. When one does perform perlocutionary acts of persuading, one does so by performing illocutionary act of stating or informing.

3. The most important characteristic possessed by illocutionary acts used to communicative have the feature that one performs them successfully simply by getting one’s illocutionary intention recognized.

2.3.2 Ways of Performing Illocutionary Act
Speech acts in general, and illocutionary acts in particular can be performed in variety of ways. According to Akmajian et.al, (1980) there are some ways of performing of speech acts:

1. Literal Act, happens if the speaker means what he says in his utterances.
2. Non Literal Act is the contradiction of literal act where the speaker does not mean what he says.
3. Direct Act, is when a speaker does not perform that act by means of performing any other act.
4. Indirect Act, happen when a speaker performs that act by means of performing another speech act.

In communicating, sometimes we find a speaker says an utterance to hearer, but the hearer cannot understand what a speaker intend to. It may be possible for a speaker to state something successfully but still fail as communication. The reason for that may be the hearer asleep, the hearer not know what the words mean or the hearer may not know the language. Thus, to be successful in communication, the hearer must identify what it is the speaker means to do (state, order, ask, report, promise, etc.)

There are six possibilities of the ways of performing illocutionary acts as quoted by Risana (2005:21-22), they are:

1. Literal direct act
   It is literal when the illocution of the act most directly indicated by literal reading of grammatical form the vocabulary of the utterance.

2. Non literal direct act
   In this case the illocution of an utterance is not directly indicated by the literal reading of grammatical form and the vocabulary of the utterance.
3. Literal direct act + Non literal indirect act

In literal direct act, the speaker means what he says literally and it is not performed any other act. In nonliteral indirect, the speaker does not mean what his word means literally and he performs the act by means of performing another speech act.

4. Literal direct act + Literal indirect act

In literal direct act, the speaker means what he says literally and it is not performed by means of performing any other act. In literal indirect, although the speaker means what he says, but it is performed by means of performing any other act.

5. Non literal direct act + Non literal indirect act

In nonliteral indirect act, the speaker does not mean what these words mean literally and it is not performed by means of performing any other. In nonliteral indirect act, the speaker does not mean what his words mean literally but it is performed by means of performing any other acts.

6. Non literal direct act + Literal indirect act

In nonliteral direct act, the speaker does not mean what his words really mean and it is not performed by mean of any other act. In literal indirect act the speaker means what he says but it is performed by means performing any other act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Speech Act 1</th>
<th>Speech Act 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Please, come back!</td>
<td>Literal (Request)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This book is very thin.</td>
<td>Nonliteral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literal</td>
<td>Nonliteral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I got drying in my throat.</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have a knife in my hand.</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Go away! Wherever you want.</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(First, it is used sarcastically to point out that the wife does not like her husband leave the house. Secondly, it is used to ask her husband to stop leaving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The typical example of nonliteral direct act and literal indirect act are rare and hard to find.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 The Classification of Illocutionary Acts

The classification of illocutionary acts propose by Searle (1976) is a development of ideas that appears in Austin’s theory. They are five basic kind of action that can perform in speaking by mean of the following five types of utterance that is developing by Yule (1996:53-54), they are:

**A. Declaratives**

Declaratives are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance. The acts of declaratives are approving, betting, blessing,
instructing, confirming, cursing, declaring, disapproving, dismissing, naming, resigning, etc.

Example: I quit from this job → resigning

Searle (1975:13) states it is the defining characteristic of this class that the successful performance of one of its members brings about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality, successful performance guarantees that the propositional content corresponds to the world.

B. Representative

Representatives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be case or not. The type include arguing, asserting, boasting, claiming, complaining, criticizing, denying, describing, informing, insisting, reporting, suggesting, swearing, etc.

Example: I met your parent yesterday → informing

Searle (1975:10) states that the point or purpose of the members of the representative class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something’s being the case, to the truth of expressed proposition. All of the members of the representative class are assessable on the dimension of assessment which includes true and false.

C. Expressives

Expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speakers feel.

The acts are apologizing complimenting, condoling, congratulating, deploring, praising, regretting, thanking, etc.

There are six types of expressives, which will be analyzed in this thesis, they are:
1. Expressives for Thank

Expressing gratitude is considered to be one universals of interpersonal communication, in particular in realization of the politeness principle. Thanking is classified as an expressive illocutionary act that can be defined as an expression of gratitude on the part of the speaker to the addressee. For example: ‘Thank you so much for coming.’

2. Expressives for Apologize

Apologizing is an expression of regret. Some definitions of apologizing such as; acknowledge faults or shortcoming failing, defend, explain, clear away or make excuses for by reasoning. There also some related terms of apologizing: alibi out of, apologize for, ask forgiveness, beg pardon, express regret, plead guilty, do penance and so on. For example: “I beg your pardon.”

3. Expressive for Congratulating

Congratulating, applauding and condoling are the kinds of expressives for congratulation. Those show the speaker’s sympathy toward what has been happening to the hearer. Congratulating expresses the feeling of pleasure toward the hearer’s luck, applauding expresses the feeling of honor toward hearer’s ability, while condoling expresses the feeling of compassion toward the hearer’s sadness. For example: “I congratulate you for your graduation.”

4. Expressives for Greetings

Greeting is an expression of welcoming. It is also the act of greeting by the speaker to the hearer. For example: “Good morning, mom.”
5. Expressives for Wishes

Wishing is the expression of speaker’s desire and wants in order to expect it becomes reality. For example: “I wish you were here.”

6. Expressives for Attitudes

This kind of expressives is about criticizing, complaining, and deprecating that express the feeling of disagree or dislike with the hearer’s attitude. Those expect the hearer to mull over the speaker’s utterance. For example: “That’s no good.”

D. Directives

Directives are those kinds of speech acts that the speakers use to get someone else to do something. The acts are advising, asking, begging, challenging, daring, demanding, forbidding, insisting, inviting, ordering, permitting, recommending, requesting, suggesting, etc.

Example: Don’t go to the party! → Forbidding

Searle (1975:11) says that the illocutionary point of these consists in the fact that they are attempts (of varying degrees, and hence, more precisely, they are determinates of determinable which includes attempting) by the speaker to get the hearer to do something.

E. Commicives

Commissives are those kinds’ acts that the speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. The acts are committing, guaranteeing, offering, promising, refusing, threatening, volunteering, vowing etc.

Example: I will be there at 5 o’clock. → Promising
Searle (1975:11) says that commissives then are those illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker (again in varying degrees) to some future course of action.

2.4 Relevant Studies

In the completing of this thesis, I use some previous researches that discuss the same topic, illocutionary acts, as references to completing this thesis. Here they are as follow:

Maznilkhairi (2011) in his thesis “An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in The Pursuit of Happyness” analyzes Directive illocutionary acts in the movie. He uses library research with descriptive method in the analysis. He finds that there are two types of directive illocution in that movie; they are direct directives and indirect directives. The author concluded from the number of the utterances in directive illocutionary act that has the highest percentage of all is the presence of DirectDirectives.

LiaAgustinaDamanik (2012) in her thesis “Speech Act Classification InSlumdog Millionaire” analyzes illocutionary acts in the movie. She uses library research with descriptive method in the analysis. She finds that there are five types of illocutionary acts in that movie; they are verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behabitives, and expositives. After analyzing all the utterances by the whole characters in Slumdog Millionaire, it is found that there are 382 utterances which can be characterized for each illocutionary acts category; expositives(60,15%),
behabiives (23.5%), exercitives (9.5%), commisives (4.74%), and verdictives (2.11%). She finds that the most dominant illocution appeared is expositives.

Risana A. Silalahi (2005) in her thesis “Expressive Illocution on James Herriot’s All Things Wise and Wonderful: A Pragmatic Analysis” analyzes expressive illocution in the novel. She uses library research with descriptive method in the analysis. She describes that there are six types of expressive illocution; they are a. Expressives for Thank, Expressives for Apologize, Expressives for Congratulations, Expressives for Greetings, Expressives for Wishes, and Expressives for Attitudes. She finds the most dominant expressives used in the novel is expressive for thanking.

I would like to explain that my analysis focuses on describing the findings of expressive illocutionary acts in the shows and how they are performed. I also do the library research with descriptive method. By watching the Oprah Winfrey’s talk shows and then read the scripts I will find expressive illocutionary acts in each utterances. After that the process of collecting data also was done by re-watching the talk show and did the technique of collecting data while re-reading the Oprah Winfrey’s talk show script is a must in order to get a better understanding of the speeches, classify them into specific category and show how they are performed in the dialogues. Then I use formula to count the number of occurrence. It can be said my analysis is nearly the same with Risana but I do the other thing, which is to show the performing of expressive illocutionary acts in the dialogues in the shows.