

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The related of literature and theoretical framework will be reviewed in this chapter. This chapter will be discussed about the meaning of the pragmatic and the parts of it. It begins with pragmatic as the approach, speech act as the part of pragmatic, illocutionary as the type of speech act, and commissive act as the classification of speech act. Furthermore, the types and the function of commissive speech act will be shown in this chapter. There is also inclusion of previous study and theoretical framework of the research.

2.1 Pragmatics

As stated by Birner (2013), the definition of pragmatics includes referring with literal meaning in use or meaning in context. Specifically, pragmatics is defined as a study that had the relation between speaker's meaning and interpretation of utterances. Speech act theory has been used by linguists in the field of pragmatic analysis, but it has also been applied to literary texts. Speech acts are utterances in which the speaker performs an action.

Yule (2014) mentioned that pragmatics refers to the hidden meaning of words that are understood by not how it is written or spoken. It is referred that Pragmatics studies the hidden meaning of words that are not directly said or written but rather implied in between words.

Levinson (1983) started previously that Pragmatics studies the signs relation for the listener. This refers to the hidden meaning found in between text and the

actual mean according to the listener. It can be said that as meaning is different to different people, the meaning can shift around despite the word being the same.

Pragmatics has a more specific part called speech act. An activity performed through utterances in which a speaker attempts to convince the hearer of what is being conveyed is defined as speech act (Yule, 2014). Speech acts are acts of communication in this context. Communicating is to express a particular attitude, and the act of speaking is used to correspond on what the speaker intended to perform of the acts (Birner, 2013). The context of the act is needed to be known as to infer the intended meaning of the speaker. Utterances produced by a speaker can be related to three different acts, they are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and lastly perlocutionary act (Yule, 1996).

The first is locutionary. Locutionary act is the act of saying something. Locutionary act has a literal meaning, for example: "It is hot here". Based on the example meaning its location relates to the temperature of the air in that place. Another example "I am hungry", based on the example someone interprets "I" as the first single person (the speaker), and "hungry" refers to "empty stomach and needs to be filled in", without intending to ask for food. In other words, locutionary acts is acts that state something in the sense of "saying" or speech acts in the form of meaningful and understandable utterances. The second is illocutionary act. Speakers engage in illocutionary activities when they performed utterances. The illocutionary act is the second form of act as theorized. According to Yule (1996), illocutionary is the act of speaking intended by the speaker with purpose by uttering words such as asking, stating, inquiring, promoting,

commanding, apologizing, threatening, and interrogating. Speakers occasionally engage in speech acts whose communicative aim or utterance meaning differs from the obvious sentence meaning. The third is perlocutionary act. This is the last type of speech act. This type is about the hearer's response for an utterance. According to Austin (1962) a certain effect achieved by saying something is called as perlocutionary acts.

2.1.1 Commissive Speech Acts

Commissive speech acts are those in which the speakers commit themselves to a future action. According to Kreidler (2013), stated that illocutionary acts are differentiate into several kinds. They are assertive, verdictive, expressive, directive, commissive. From one of those kinds, this research will focus on commissive acts, which are the words execute the speaker to the future action. Based on Searle and Vanderveken (1985), commissive acts are refuse, promise, offer, vow, threaten, pledge, commit, accept, guarantee, and bet.

2.1.2 Types of Commissive Speech Act

There are ten types of commissive speech act. The first type of commissive is refuse. Refuse is the opposite of accepting. This condition has the relation when a person has been given the choice to accept or reject. Thus, the refusal is done by someone to disobey the order and refuse the speech act that allows the choice to refuse (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). For instance, is "Stop Marta! There's no time" (Devi & Degaf, 2021). As in the quotation, refusing is shown by how the speaker deny the listener request or opinion. The second type is promise. According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), promise in general is has the

feature of uncommon, as it is performed and done for the listener's benefits which involves obligation which then showed commitment from the speaker. For example is "I will be calm and respectful and be an observer of the truth" (Devi & Degaf, 2021). As in the quotation above, promising is shown by how the speaker is showing commitment by giving an obligation that will be done to benefit the listener.

Third, the type is offer. Offering act refers as condition illocution of acts. An offer will turn into a promise if hearer accepts the offer. So, this speech act binds the speaker to take a certain action if the offer is accepted by the hearer (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). For example "Will you do it, Marta?" (Devi & Degaf, 2021). As in the quotation above, offering is shown by the speaker giving choices or in this case asking for the listener opinion.

The next type is vow. The act of vowing is not needed to be done directly towards hearer. Speaker may simply vow to own self in determining to do something on their own. Vow usually carry a solemnity which makes it more severe than promises and threats. (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). For instance is "I bet his existence" (Devi & Degaf, 2021). As in the quotation, vowing is shown by the speaker putting themselves in line to assure something. After that, the next type is threat. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) stated that the act of threatening does not benefit the hearer, but rather to the speaker's detriment. Obligation is not involved in threaten acts, and because of the absence, it is not as dependent as the act of promising. For instance is "Tell, or I'll tell!" (Devi & Degaf, 2021). As in the quotation above, threatening is shown by how the speaker gives the listener

two choices that will not benefit the listener upon the act. The sixth type is pledge. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) stated that pledge is quite similar to swearing, however it may not always be as solemn. a pledge is a strong commitment to a future course of action. Pledge is a serious or formal promise to give or do something. For the example, “I pledge to you one more time, together, we will make America wealthy again. We will make America strong again. We will make America safe again. And we will make America great again.” (Ulum & Sutopo, 2018). The section from Trump's address in Florida that was quoted above is the conclusion. Trump concluded his remarks by promising the gathering that they will work together to restore America's greatness and prosperity.

Next, there is commit for the seventh type. According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985) Commit, which refers to the primitive commissive illocutionary force in primitive English. Commit is a promise sincerely that the speaker will definitely do something. “We have committed to solving the problem of human rights, and to guarantee it.” (Husain, Hamamah, & Nurhayani, 2020). This datum belonged to commissive speech act. The word “committed” is the evidence of commissive speech act of commit. It had a serious purpose in solving problems in future action. For the next type is accept. An act of acceptance is determined as a response of what have the speaker said or committed to do. The context of commissive in accepting is considered simply as the acceptor lets the speaker do what he commits himself to doing so (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). In term of commissive acceptance, it is supposed to be not good for the speaker, since the speaker offered to do and its responsibilities and obligations is to

accepted by the acceptor. The ninth is guarantee. Searle and Vanderveken stated that the guarantee speech act is the speaker confident to achieve something in the future. Usually, guarantee uses to persuade someone of the truth and to fulfill obligation in the future action. “We will ensure peace through strength, two and a half trillion dollar have the strongest military we’ve ever had, beautiful brand new equipment” (Gea & Johan, 2020). The function of guarantee in the data is to describe that he able to achieve his plans and get great belief from public. The intonation of guarantee which looks in utterance “We will ensure”.

The last type is bet. A conditional bet is a double conditional like offer that needs to be accepted in order to take effect because all bets are conditional promises. Furthermore, a bet is a plan to risk money, etc. It was discovered that bet was employed when the speaker's power was at risk. (Husain, Hamamah, & Nurhayani, 2020). The utterance belonged to commissive speech act of bet. Jokowi entrusted his position in developing this nation. The word "risk" was evidence of commissive speech act. Speaker had a power at stake that was “position and reputation.” Both powers became a bet to improve this country. In this case, he fought something by entrusting his position when becoming a president.

2.1.3 Function of Illocutionary Acts

As theorized by Leech (1983), there are different degrees and kinds of politeness for several situations, considering polite and impolite linguistic behavior which corresponded mainly to the functions of illocutionary acts. It is divided into four types of illocutionary functions, which is divided based on how

it is related to the goal of maintaining and establishing comity socially. There four functions of illocutionary acts. The first is competitive. The illocutionary act done to achieve the goal and compete with the goal of social, whereas involved the negative of politeness (Leech, 1983). The act has the purpose of reducing implicit of the competition between what the speaker wants to achieve, and what of the good manners. The acts include demanding, asking, ordering, begging, etc. Here is the example to explain the function:

Tim : “Stop, I’m gonna throw up”
 Pikachu : “No, no. Kid I’m in serious trouble. I need you to listen” (Setyawan&Haryani, 2020)

This conversation expresses competitive. Regardless Tim’s condition of having ill after find the fact that he is able to communicate to Pikachu. Pikachu insist to demand Tim to listen and help him instead he helps Tim who is having a stomach-ache (Tim express that he wants to throw up). The second function is convivial. The act of illocutionary done to coincide with social goal, takes the positive form of politeness in seeking for comity’s opportunities (Leech, 1983). It is done towards the other of the speaker with positive intention and purpose once there is an opportunity. The acts can be greeting, inviting, thanking, offering, congratulating, etc. For example: “This is the location I had in mind. It is a wonderful piece of land. It is perfect. You can work with it” (Sangeroki Silvia, 2019). Lara offered Charlen Colin a location which Colin can put up a building. In the utterance the function of convivial act is offering. Colin could work in a wonderful piece of land. Lara offered him to work together with her.

The next function is collaborative. The category of collaborative illocutionary act has indifferent goal to social, which politeness is irrelevant (Leech, 1983). Most of the written discourses are considered to be in this category, it can be the act of announcing, reporting, asserting, and instructing. There is an example below to make it clear:

Pikachu : “We will do this. You and me”
 Tim : “I can be... Okay, we’ll meet here tomorrow morning” (Setyawan&Haryani, 2020)

Pikachu pursued Tim to help him in a case. At first, Tim didn’t want to help him, yet he suddenly changed his mind. The utterance used by time is collaborative motive, because he implies that he would help Pikachu. The last function is conflictive. Conflictive is an illocutionary act category that conflicts with social goal, and completely does not involved politeness as their nature is designed to cause offences (Leech, 1983). It includes the act of cursing, accusing, threatening, and reprimanding. The conversation below will show the example of conflictive:

Pikachu : “You don’t need to talk. For us I can feel what you all saying. You have to be opened to the experience. Try it sometimes.”
 Tim : “Yeah, I’d rather not. I already crazy talking to you”
 (Setyawan & Haryani, 2020)

In this dialogue, Tim has conflictive motive. In this scene Pikachu tried to explain that usually Pokémon and their tamer communicate via understanding trough heart to heart. Yet, rejecting Pikachu’s suggesting using rude expression that may hurt Pikachu’s feeling.

2.2 Previous Research

Researcher reviewed some articles that were working on the same topic as this research to back up their findings. The researcher identified a few articles that dealt with illocutionary acts. The first researcher was Putri et al., (2019) described the speech acts that are found in the movie Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire. The data found will be analyzed as three forms such as locutionary act, illocutionary act and also perlocutionary acts. The researcher divided and analyzed the data according to the respective types of acts and also mentioned the most frequently found type among the acts.

The second researcher was Rosyidi et al. (2019) analyzed the acts of illocutionary uttered by Joko Widodo in the Indonesia's first election for president in 2019. The study used Searle's theory of acts of illocutionary. With the total of 13 data, the result shows that there are 4 types found with assertive acts of illocutionary as the most dominant and commissive acts of illocutionary as the least dominant.

The next researcher was Syafitri (2019) identified forms, patterns and also the functions of commissive acts uttered in a TV shopping show titled MNC Shop. The study used the theory of commissive acts' form and pattern which is proposed by Alwi and Putrayasa. The study also used theory proposed by Yule and Ibrahim to identify the function of commissive speech acts. With the total of 55 data, the study resulted on 3 forms of commissive speech acts found with the most dominant functions are found to be giving guarantee, promising and then convincing.

Then, Haucsa et al., (2020) discussed the illocutionary acts regarding the types and functions found in an interview done by Tom Cruise. The study showed that there are four types found in the research with representative as the most commonly found. It is shown that the statement conveyed often is to give statements or describe facts.

The fifth researcher was Nainggolan et al. (2020) analyzed the acts of illocutionary found in “The Matrix” movie. The study used Searle’s classification of illocutionary acts as well as Hasan and Halliday’s theory of context. With a total of 113 data, the study shows that there are 4 acts of illocutionary found which are representative, directive, commissive, and expressive. The most frequently found acts of illocutionary is directives and commissive is the least frequently found.

The sixth researcher was Desica and Ambalegin (2021) This research aimed to find out the types of commissive acts found in the movie entitled Onward as the data source. The utterances uttered by the characters in the movie were taken as the data of the research and classified them by using the theory of commissive acts proposed by Searle. The research result showed that there were 17 utterances of commissive acts found in Onward movie. They were 2 data of promising, 4 data of threatening, 2 data of accepting, 6 data of refusing, and 2 data of offering.

The last researcher was Devi and Degaf (2021) studied the types and functions of commissive acts found on the movie titled Knives Out. The theory used in the study was Searle and Austin’s theory of acts of illocutionary. With the

total of 13 data, the study shows 6 types of commissive acts of illocutionary found and rejection is the main motivator for the speeches.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This research will use pragmatics as an approach and commissive acts as the topic. In commissive acts, the researcher will analyze the type of commissive acts using the theory by Searle and Vanderveken (1985) and the function of commissive acts using the theory by Leech (1983). This research will use “Tangled” movie as a data source.

