2.1 Pragmatics

Yule (1996:3) states that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might means by themselves. Peccei (1999: 2) states “pragmatics concentrates on those aspects of meaning that cannot be predicted by linguistic knowledge alone and takes into account knowledge about the physical and social world”.

One traditional distinction in language analysis consists pragmatics with syntax and semantics. Syntax is the study of relationship between linguistic forms, semantics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and entities in the world, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms.

In this three parts distinction, only pragmatics allows human into the analysis. The advantages of this studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people’s intended meanings, their assumptions, their purpose or goals, and the kinds of actions (for example, request) that they are performing when they speak.
2.2 Speech Acts

Speech act theory is attributed to the Oxford philosopher J. L. Austin. The basic ideas, which were formed by him in the late 1930s, were presented in his lectures given at Oxford in 1952–1954, and later in his William James Lectures delivered at Harvard in 1955. These lectures were finally published posthumously as *How To Do Things With Words* in 1962. In that book, Austin (1962: 94) told that to say something is to do something, or in saying something, and even by saying something we do something.

Speech acts explain when people want to express themselves, they do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, they perform actions via those utterances. If you work in a situation where a boss has a great deal of power, then the boss’s utterance of the expression is more than just statement.

(1) You’re fired.

The utterance in (1) can be used to perform the act of ending your employment. However, the actions performed by utterances do not have to be as dramatic or as unpleasant as in (1). The action can be quite pleasant, as in the compliment performed by (2.a), the acknowledgement of thanks in [2.b], or the expression of surprise in [2.c].

(2.a) You’re delicious.

(2.b) You’re welcome.

(2.c) You’re crazy.
Generally, Speech acts are actions performed via utterances, in English, are commonly given more specific labels, such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, or request.

Austin claimed that all utterances, in addition to meaning whatever they mean, perform specific acts via the specific communicative force of an utterance. Furthermore, he introduced a threefold distinction among the acts one simultaneously performs when saying something, as illustrated in:

(i) Locutionary act: the production of a meaningful linguistic expression.

(ii) Illocutionary act: the action intended to be performed by a speaker in uttering a linguistic expression, by virtue of the conventional force associated with it, either explicitly or implicitly.

(iii) Perlocutionary act: the bringing about of consequences or effects on the audience through the uttering of a linguistic expression, such consequences or effects being special to the circumstances of utterance.

2.2.1 Locutionary Act

In Austin (1962: 95), a locutionary act is the basic act of speaking, which itself consists of three related sub-acts:

(i) a phonic act of producing an utterance-inscription;

(ii) a phatic act of composing a particular linguistic expression in a particular language; and

(iii) a rhetoric act of contextualizing the utterance-inscription.
The first of these three sub-acts is concerned with the physical act of producing a certain sequence of vocal sounds (in the case of spoken language), or a set of written symbols (in the case of written language). The second refers to the act of constructing a well-formed string of sounds/symbols (a word, phrase, or sentence in a particular language). The third sub-act is responsible for tasks such as assigning reference, resolving deixis, and disambiguating the utterance-inscription lexically and/or grammatically.

2.2.2 Illocutionary Act

The illocutionary act refers to the fact that when we say something, we usually say it with some purpose in mind. In other words, an illocutionary act refers to the type of function the speaker intends to fulfill, or the action the speaker intends to accomplish in the course of producing an utterance; it is also an act defined within a system of social conventions. In short, it is an act accomplished in speaking. Examples of illocutionary acts include accusing, apologizing, blaming, congratulating, declaring war, giving permission, joking, marrying, nagging, naming, promising, ordering, refusing, swearing, and thanking.

The functions or actions just mentioned are also commonly referred to as the illocutionary ‘force’ (or ‘point’) of the utterance. Illocutionary force is frequently conveyed by what Searle called an ‘illocutionary force indicating device’ (IFID), the most direct and conventional type of which is an explicit performative in the form of (a) (where Vp stands for performative verb). Indeed, the term ‘speech act’ in its narrow sense is often taken to refer exclusively to illocutionary acts.

(a) *I (hereby)* Vp *you (that)* S
2.2.2.1 Illocutionary Classification

Peecei (1999: 52), there are five classification of speech act:

1. Representatives

Representatives (or assertives; the constatives of the original Austinian performative/constative dichotomy) are those kinds of speech acts that commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition and thus carry a truth-value. They express the speaker’s belief. In performing this type of speech act, the speaker represents the world as he or she believes it is, thus making the words fit the world of belief. Paradigmatic cases include:

1. Asserting: to state a fact confidently and forcefully
2. Claiming: to assert that one has gained or achieved and state something without providing evidence or proof
3. Predicting: to say or estimate that will happen in the future
4. Affirming: to declare a fact publicly and for support, uphold or defend
5. Retelling: to tell again something with another way.
6. Informing: to give somebody about information about something.
7. Concluding: to bring something to and end.
8. Stating: to express something definitely and clearly.
9. Explaining: to make clear to someone by describing more detail and account an event by giving reason or justification.

Example:

- That’s what make America great (asserting)
- That's why elections matter (stating)
2. Directives

Directives are those kinds of speech acts that represent attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something. They express the speaker’s desire/wish for the addressee to do something. In using a directive, the speaker intends to elicit some future course of action on the part of the addressee, thus making the world match the words via the addressee. Paradigmatic cases include:

1. Inviting: a friendly request to someone to go somewhere or to do something.
2. Commanding: to make somebody what they must to do
3. Ordering: to tell somebody to do something. Ordering is more polite than commanding
4. Requesting: to act politely asking for something
5. Suggesting: to put an idea to someone’s mind

Example:

- Let me said this publicly (requesting)
- We can do this for our country (ordering)
- Go there! (commanding)

3. Commissives

Commissives are those kinds of speech acts that commit the speaker to some future course of action. They express the speaker’s intention to do something. In the case of a commissive, the world is adapted to the words via the speaker him/herself. Paradigmatic cases include:
1. Hoping: a demand something to happen or to do something

2. Refusing: to show that one is disagree or unwilling to give, accept or do something

3. Promising: a spoken that one will definitely give or do or not do something

4. Offering: to show willingness to do or give something

Examples:

- No, Thank you (refusing)
- I’ll make this country great (promising)
- That’s the future that we hope (hoping)

4. Expressives

Expressives are those kinds of speech acts that express a psychological attitude or state of the speaker such as joy, sorrow, and likes/dislikes. There is no direction of fit for this type of speech act. Paradigmatic cases include:

1. Congratulating: to express about praise or something that somebody get

2. Complimenting: an expression of praise, admiration, approval, etc

3. Thanking: to express gratitude to somebody

4. Believing: to express belief about something or somebody

Examples:

- I believe in you (believing)
- Thank you (thanking)
- You are best women (complement)
5. Declarations

Declarations (or declaratives) are those kinds of speech acts that effect immediate changes in some current state of affairs. Because they tend to rely on elaborate extralinguistic institutions for their successful performance, they may be called institutionalized performatives. In performing this type of speech act, the speaker brings about changes in the world; that is, he or she effects a correspondence between the propositional content and the world. Paradigmatic cases include (officially) opening a bridge, declaring war, excommunicating, firing from employment, and nominating a candidate. As to the direction of fit, it is both words-to-world and world-to-words.

I now pronounce you husband and wife  (declaring)

I name my baby “Dila”    (naming)

To more understanding about the similarities and differences between the speech act categories that we have been discussing will show in this table below based on the relation between ‘words’ and ‘world’. (Peccei, 1999: 53)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Acts Category</th>
<th>Relation Between ‘The Words’ and ‘The World’</th>
<th>Who is Responsible for The Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representatives</td>
<td>The words fit the world (‘outside’ world)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>The world will fit the words</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expressives  The words fit the world (physiological world)  Speaker

Commisives  The world will fit the words  Speaker

Declarations  The words change the world  Speaker

After the table above, there is also a table which describe how the direct interpretation comes from other linguistic features of the utterance which we recognize as typical linguistic expressions of speech acts. (Peccei, 1999: 54)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Acts Category</th>
<th>Typical Expression</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representatives</td>
<td>Declarative structure</td>
<td>Tom’s eating grapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directives</td>
<td>Imperative sentence</td>
<td>Si down!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>Declarative structure with words referring to feelings</td>
<td>I’m sorry to hear that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commisives</td>
<td>Declarative structure with speaker subject and future time expressed</td>
<td>I’ll call you tonight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaratives</td>
<td>Declarative structure with speaker as subject and a performative verb in simple present tense</td>
<td>We find the defendant guilty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I resign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.3 Perlocutionary Act

Perlocutionary act concerns the effect an utterance may have on the addressee. Put slightly more technically, a perlocution is the act by which the illocution produces a certain effect in or exerts a certain influence on the addressee. Still another way to put it is that a perlocutionary act represents a consequence or by-product of speaking, whether intentional or not. The effect of the act being performed by speaking is generally known as the perlocutionary effect. There is an extensive literature on the differentiation between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts.

The understanding between locution, illocution, and perlocution can be found in this example:

“could you make a cup of coffee?”

Locution: The speaker uttered the words which semantically mean requesting the listener to make a cup of coffee.

Illocution: The speaker performed an act of requesting the listener to make a coffee.

Perlocution: The speaker persuaded the hearer to give a coffee, and as response, the listener gave a cup of coffee as the speaker wishes.

2.3 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Languages have three basic sentence types: declarative, interrogative, and imperative and the three general communicative functions (statement, questions, and command/request). In the case of a direct match between a sentence type and an
illocutionary force, we have a direct speech act. In addition, explicit performatives, which happen to be in the declarative form, are also taken to be direct speech acts, because they have their illocutionary force explicitly named by the performative verb in the main part (or ‘matrix clause’) of the sentence. On the other hand, if there is no direct relationship between a sentence type and an illocutionary force, we are faced with an indirect speech act. Thus, when an explicit performative is used to make a request, as in (a), it functions as a direct speech act; the same is the case when an imperative is employed, as in (b). By comparison, when an interrogative is used to make a request, as in (c), we have an indirect speech act.

(a) I request you to pass the salt (Declarative) (statement)
(b) Pass the salt. (Interrogative) (question)
(c) Can you pass the salt? (Imperative) (command/request)

Yule (1996: 54) tells that whenever, there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, that is direct speech act. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and function, that is indirect speech act. A declarative used to make statement is a direct speech act, but a declarative used to make a request is an indirect speech act.

Example:

(a) I hereby tell you about the weather. (direct speech act)
(b) I hereby request of you that you close the door. (indirect speech act)
Indirect speech acts are generally associated with greater politeness in English than direct speech acts. In order to understand why, we have to look at a bigger picture than just a single utterance performing a single speech acts.

### 2.4. Relevant Studies

In analyzing the speech acts in this thesis, some relevant studies to support the analysis, they are:

Banjarnahor (2011) analysis the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts produced by film script of Margareth Tate and Andrew Paxton. The illocution becomes representatives, commissives, directives, expressives, rogatives, and declaratives. Rinandes use the descriptive method and the data collected by applying the library reserach method.

The result for her thesis are found 365 utterances that consist of 190 representatives (52.21%), 72 directives (19.72), 66 rogatives (18.08%), 20 commissives (5.4%), 13 expressives (3.5%), and 4 declaration (1.09%). Rinandes also found 14 perlocutionary acts by Margareth and Andrew.

Banjarnahor’s thesis and the writer thesis is relevant because her thesis analyzing illocutionary acts classification too. The similarity between Rinandes’s thesis and this thesis is the theory from Searle’s theory. But there are several differences between this thesis:

a. Banjarnahor’s thesis analyzed the illocutionary classification on film script entitled *The Proposal* and this thesis analyzed the illocutionary classification
on speech by Barack Obama when he becomes to be President of USA for twice in 2012.

b. Banjarnahor’s thesis analyzed about illocutionary classification and perlocutionary and this thesis analyzed about illocutionary classification and direct indirect speech acts.

c. Banjarnahor’s thesis use rogatives illocutionary from Peccei.

Damanik (2012) analysis the illocutionary and explanation for the finding dominant acts produced by film Slumdog Millionaire. The illocution becomes verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behavities, and expositives. She printed movie dialogue script and get certain picture of what the dialogues talk about are.

The result for her thesis are found 370 utterances that consist of 227 expositives (61,35%), 81 behabitives (21,89%), 36 exercitives (9,7%), 18 commisives (4,86%), and 8 verdictives (2,2%). She also found the expositives is most dominant act because every people who utter something, as long as their utterances are fit to the conversation, they have created an expositives.

The writer uses Damanik’s thesis as relevant study because her thesis is the current thesis analyzing illocutionary act classification too. The similarity between this thesis and Damanik’s thesis is subject both of this thesis is illocutionary acts. This thesis and Damanik’s thesis use similairy method is from Huberman and Miles with qualitative method. But, there are some differences between this thesis and Damanik’s thesis:

a. This thesis and Damanik’s thesis use different theory. This thesis uses Peccei’s theory. While, Damanik’s thesis uses Austin’s theory. The
classification acts to be “verdictives, exercitives, commisives, behavitives, and expostives”.

b. This thesis analyze about illocution classification and explanation for finding the dominant illocution act. While, this thesis analyze about illocution classification and direct and indirect speech act.

d. The object of Damanik’s thesis is film entitled Slumdog Millionaire and this thesis analyzed the illocutionary classification on speech by Barack Obama when he becomes to be President of USA for twice in 2012.

c. Damanik’s thesis is analyze about lowest class who lives in the society. While, this thesis analyze about the highest class who led the power country that is USA.

Purba (2012) analysis the hedges and presupposition which found in Brack Obama Speeches. The hedges become passive voice verb, hypothetical construction, epistemic verbs, adverbial construction, modal verbs, cognition verbs, and questions construction. The presupposition become existential presupposition, counterfactual presupposition, non-factive presupposition, factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, and structural presupposition. Purba uses descriptive qualitative method and use Grice and Yule theory.

The result of his thesis are found 1 data for passive voice verb, 36 datas for hypothetical construction, 12 datas for epistemic verbs, 13 datas for adverbial construction, 38 datas for modal verbs, 4 datas for cognition verbs, and 5 datas for questions construction. For presupposition found 22 datas for existential presupposition, 30 datas for counterfactual presupposition, 38 datas for non-factive
presupposition, 13 datas for factive presupposition, 1 data lexical presupposition, and 5 datas for structural presupposition.

Purba’s thesis and this thesis are relevant because also talk about pragmatics and same object that is Barack Obama Speech. But there are some difference between this thesis and Purba’s thesis:

a. Purba’s thesis uses three speech of Obama. While, this speech uses one speech of Obama.
b. Purba’s thesis talk about hedges and presupposition. While, this thesis talk about illocution acts and direct and indirect speech acts.
c. Purba’s thesis use descriptive qualitative method. While, this thesis use qualitative method from Huberman & Miles.