CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter the writer presents the theories that support the topic of her study. She divides into two chapters that are theoretical framework and review of previous study. In the theoretical framework, there is review of related theories. The writer takes this theories from books and some resources. Thus she relates two theories that are illocutionary acts and context to analyze the Akeelah’s utterances. The writer presents about pragmatics, context, speech acts, and type of illocutionary acts. They are very important for the writer and can help to solve the statement of problem in her study.

2.1.1 The Definition of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a study of meaning and language that dependent on the speaker and the addressee based on the context of utterance. Based on Paltridge (2006:53) pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. This includes social, situational and textual context. It also includes background knowledge context; that is, what people know about each other and about world. Yule (1996:3) says that pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. The explanation above that pragmatics is study what the speaker says and the listener interprets the speaker’s utterances to get the meaning.
Pragmatics in this study is about speaker’s intention in uttering a speech act and knowing the function of pragmatics. The function of pragmatics is interpreting the elements in a piece of utterances, it is necessary to know who the speaker and hearer are, the time and place of the production of the utterances and what the speaker and hearer talking about.

2.1.2 Context

Context is the interpretation of what people means. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances. Based on Paltridge (2006:54) that the linguistic context, in terms of what has been said and what is yet to be said in the discourse, also has an impact on the intended meaning and how someone may interpret this meaning in spoken and written discourse. From explaining above that context is the result of the hearer or the reader interprets the utterances based on the background. It is supported by Thomas (1995) in Paltridge (2006:54) that context is produced in interaction.

In this study, the writer chooses the context of situation to analyze the types of speech acts. Context of situation; who is speaking to whom, when, where, and for what purpose; the physical setting, the social scene in which the discourse occurs; the roles and status of the participants involved (Georgakopoulo, 1997: 18) in Fidayanti (2012).
From that case, the writer can explain that situational context interprets the background knowledge about who, whom, what, when, where, how in social scene. Therefore it is suitable to analyze speech acts and the writer needs to know the background knowledge of the utterances. Such as, who is speaking to whom, when, where, and what talking about. Hymes (1964) in Brown and Yule (1983: 38) that sets about specifying the features of context which may be relevant to the identification of a type of speech event. So, the writer takes theory of Hymes (1964) to analyze them.

Hymes (1974) in Elham, Alireza, and Farhad’s Journal (Vol 2, 2012: 29) also proposed that these speech events have components that should be taken into account to produce a satisfactory description of any particular speech event. He offers the mnemonic device of SPEAKING grid as a heuristic for the various factors he deems to be relevant. Such factors are ‘setting’, ‘participants’, ‘ends’, ‘act sequences’, ‘key’, ‘instrumentalities’, and ‘genre’. This set of components is referred to as the ‘speaking grid’ and its purpose is to help the analysts to put their analysis in some kinds.

Hymes (1964) states in Brown and Yule (1983:37) that the role of context in interpretation as, on the one hand, limiting the range of possible interpretations and, on the other, as supporting the intended interpretation. Thus Hymes (1964) sets about specifying the features of context which may be relevant to the identification of speech event.
They are nine features: participant (addressor, addressee, audience) topic, setting, channel, code, message-form, event, key and purpose.

The explanation are;

1. Participant (Addressor, Addressee and Audience)

   The adressor is the speaker or writer who produces the utterance. While the addressee is the hearer or reader who is the recipient of the utterance. The last, Audience is presence of overhearers may contribute to the specification of the speech event.

2. Topic

   Topic is what is being talked about.

3. Setting

   Setting is terms of where the event is situated in place and time.

4. Channel

   Channel is how is contact between the participants in the event being maintained by speech, writing, signing, smoke signal.

5. Code

   Code is what language, or dialect, or style of language is being used.

6. Message-form

   Message-form is what form is intended; chat, debate, sermon, fairy-tale, sonnet, love-letter, etc.

7. Event

   Event is the nature of the communicative event within which a genre may be embedded.
8. **Key**

Key is which involves evaluation.

9. **Purpose**

Purpose is what did the participants intended should come about as a result of communicative event (Brown and Yule, 1983:38).

From this theory, the writer in this study takes some of features. They are the participants, the setting, the event, and the topic to identify the context. She uses this features, because she wants to know what Akeelah means in her utterances.

### 2.1.3 Speech Act

The term speech act was coined by Austin (1962) and developed by Searle (1969). Austin and Searle in Paltridge (2006:55) argue that language is used to ‘do things’ other than just refer to truth or falseness of particular statements. They argue that in the same way that we perform physical acts, we also perform acts using language. That is, we use language to give orders, to make requests, to give warnings or to give advice; in other words, to do things that go beyond the literal meaning of what we say. So, Austin and Searle define speech acts as acts is what someone says and what the person intends by what they say.

An important notion in speech act theory is the concept of falcicity condition. Austin (1975) in Wardaugh (2006:285) says that a speech act changes in some way the conditions that exist in the world. It
does something, and it is not something that in itself is either true or false. Truth and falsity may be claims made about its having been done, but they cannot be made about the actual doing. Austin pointed out that the ‘circumstances’ mentioned above can be prescribed. He mentions certain felicity conditions that performatives must meet to be successful.

1. A conventional procedure must exist for doing whatever is to be done, and that procedure must specify who must say and do what and in what circumstances.

2. All participants must properly execute this procedure and carry it through to completion. Finally,

3. The necessary thoughts, feelings, and intentions must be present in all parties.

In the speech act, there also contain direct and indirect speech acts. Indirect speech often intends something that is quite different from the literal meaning of what we say. It is supported in Searle (1979:31) says that indirect speech acts is the problem of how it is possible for the speaker to say one thing and mean that but also to mean something else.

In Searle (1969: chapter 3) shown in Searle (1979: 31) she also says that,

“I suggested that many such utterances could be explained by the fact that the sentences in question concern conditions of the felicitous performance of the speech acts there are used to perform indirectly-preparatory conditions, propositional content conditions, and sincerity conditions, and that their use to perform indirect speech acts consists in indicating the satisfaction of on essential
condition by means of asserting or questioning one of the other conditions.”

Based on this case, the direct speech act is the speech act presents their function directly. While the indirect speech act presents their function indirectly. The writer gives the example for the understanding. Direct speech act’s example is “I hereby tell you about the weather” it means that, someone tells about the weather to the hearer. In orders the hearers know and believe about the weather at that time. Whereas indirect speech act’s example is “I hereby request of you that you close the door”. This interpreting is someone requests to hearer to close the door politely. Based on Yule (1998: 55) that there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have a direct speech act. Whenever here is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have an indirect speech act. When the utterance is used to make a statement, it is functioning as a direct speech act. When the utterance is used to make a command/ request, it is functioning an indirect speech act. In this study the writer provides this theory to support her in interpreting the illocutionary that relates with context on the utterances.

### 2.1.4 Speech Act Classification

Paltridge (2006:55) says that Austin argued, there are three kinds of locutionary acts, the illocutionary acts, and the perlocutionary acts.
i. Locutionary Acts

Locutionary acts refer to the literal meaning of the actual words. For example: if someone say “This room is too dark”. The appearance of that utterance is locution.

ii. Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary acts refers to the speaker’s intention in uttering the words. In fine, illocutionary acts is what the speaker intends to communicate to the addressee. In example before “This room is dark”. The illocution is the intention of the speaker that he wants someone to turn the lamp on. Austin (1975) in Wardaugh (2006:280) divides performatives into five categories:

1) **Verdictives**, typified by the giving of a verdict, estimate, grade, or appraisal (‘We find the accused guilty’).
2) **Exercitives**, the exercising of powers, rights, or influences as in appointing, ordering, warning, or advising (‘I pronounce you husband and wife’).
3) **Commissives**, typified by promising or undertaking, and committing one to do something by, for example, announcing an intention or espousing a cause (‘I hereby bequeath’).
4) **Behabitives**, having to do with such matters as apologizing, congratulating, blessing, cursing, or challenging (‘I apologize’).
5) *Expositives*, a term used to refer to how one makes utterances fit into an argument or exposition (‘I argue,’ ‘I reply,’ or ‘I assume’).

Illocutionary acts also need illocutionary force indicating device to intend direction sentence. Searle (1979:18) said that the illocutionary force indicating device in the sentence operates on the propositional content to indicate among other things the direction of fit between the propositional content and reality. Based on Yule (1996: 49) Illocutionary force indicating device in is an expression of the type shown in where there is a slot for a verb that explicitly names the illocutionary act being performed. Such a verb can be called a performative verb (Vp). For example “I [Vp] you that….” In other IFIDs which can be identified are word order, stress, and intonation, as shown in the different versions of the same basic elements.

Based on the explanation above, the writer will explain again. Illocutionary force is indicating somethings in the direction sentence (like; word order, stress, intonation, juncture, punctuation, the verb or performative verbs etc.) that help the hearer to understand clearly what the speakers saying to classify the type of illocutionary acts. For example when Akeelah says to Kiana:

A. Kiana gets that baby out of here.

B. Kiana, get that baby out of here.
C. Does Kiana get that baby out of here?

The utterances mean:

a. The illocutionary force in A is Kiana tells that Kiana carry out her baby from that place.

b. The illocutionary force in B seem like A statement but it shows that ordering to Kiana that Kiana must carry out her baby from that place.

c. The illocutionary force in C is looked clearly about question if Kiana gets her baby out of that place.

From the utterances above, we can look from the other devices. They have different illocutionary force which we look from their punctuation, juncture and the intonation. The differences among those are the juncture and intonation. The first utterance uses fast intonation and there is no juncture but ended by the punctuation of dot (.)

Thus the second utterance uses the slow intonation and there is juncture in the word “Kiana” because there is punctuation of comma (,) and ended by dot (.). The last utterance uses asking intonation and it is ended by the punctuation of question mark (?).

**iii. Perlocutionary Acts**

Perlocutionary acts refer to the effect this utterance has on the thoughts or actions of the other person. In case perlocutionary acts is is what the speaker intends to communicate of what the
speaker says. For example before, “This room is dark”. The perlocution is the result that the lamp was on.

2.1.5 The Types of Illocutionary Acts

In Searle(1979: 12) also recasts Austin’s five categories of performative by what he calls their point or purpose:

1. Assertives, the point or purpose of the members of assertive class is to commit the speaker to something’s being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition. The verbs are; affirm, allege, announce, believe, boast, complain, conclude, forecast, inform, insist, predict, report, state, and suggest. If there are another verbs that includes to assertive, it is possible. For example when akeelah studies with Dr. Larabee.

   Dr. Larabee : “Ever since you found out there was such a thing as the national spelling bee you've seen yourself holding up that trophy, but if you can't say it, you can't win it. So say it.”
   Akeelah : “I want to win.”
   Dr. Larabee : “Say it louder please.”
   Akeelah : “I want to win.”
   Dr. Larabee : “You want to win what?”
   Akeelah : “I want to win the national spelling bee!”
   Dr. Larabee : “Good. Good.”

The speaker used assertive acts that that she believes that she will be the winner in spelling bee contest. She makes belief to Dr. Larabee that she can perform the best performance.

2. Directives, the illocutionary point of these consists in the fact that they are attempted by the speaker to get the hearer to do something.
The verbs are; advise, ask, beg, bid, demand, forbid, order, recommend, and request. For example when the teacher said to akeelah in the class.

The teacher : “How long did you study for this spelling test?”
Akeelah : “I didn’t.”
The teacher : “See me after class.”

The teacher’s saying is ordering. The teacher orders to akeelah to meet her in the office after the class finished.

3. Commissives, illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker to some future course of action. The verbs are; offer, promise, swear, threat, volunteer and vow. For the example when akeelah said to dr. Larabee.

Akeelah : “Any... more. I promise. I was wondering if you might reconsider coaching me for the state bee. Cause I need a coach. Bad.”
Dr. Larabee : “Badly. You need a coach badly. Come in.”

Akeelah utterance has shown that it is ‘promise’ because she uses word “promise”. She makes clarification about her problem to Dr. Larabee. She hopes that Dr. Larabee believes and wants to be her coach.

4. Expressives, illocutionary point of this class is to express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about state of affairs specified in the propositional content. The verbs are; apologize, appreciate, blame, commiserate, console, congratulation, pardon, praise, thank and welcome. For example
when Akeelah and her teachers stand on the stage and Mr. Welch order her to speech.

Mr. Welch : “I'd like to thank you all for coming out today to honor our own Akeelah Anderson!”
Akelah : “Um...thanks...a lot.”

It is directive acts that use verb ‘thank’. The speaker gives thanks to audience especially for her friends that has given support for her.

5. Declarations, it is 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. The verbs are; adjourn, appoint, baptize, christen, declare, excommunicate, name, resign and veto. The writer gives example of this type, when pasture declares the John and Merry get a married in church and in front of the audiences.

Pasture: “I declare, Jhon and Merry is the husband and wife. God blessing you”

It is declarative type, because the pasture declares a truth and holy.

His state has changed John and Merry’s status in the world.

The writer just presents the verb of types of illocutionary acts that appear in Searle (1979). In this study, Searle's theory is chosen because it is more clear and practical than Austin’s theory. Austin’s theory is more difficult to understand and still need a deeper understanding of the categories and also still need more explanation. Therefore Searle has developed a theory of Austin so that it can be understood. In addition,
this classification is more specific and detail than other classifications. But, actually Austin and Searle have same presumption that human wants to reach objectives in using language.

2.2 Review of Previous Study

Previously, there are several researches about illocutionary acts. The writer has read first is Isanna A. Muskananfola (2009) in Faculty of Letters Petra Christian University university Surabaya. The title is Analysis of illocutionary acts in “Victory Speech” and “Inaugural Speech” of Barrack Obama. This study was a descriptive qualitative study on illocutionary acts of speeches delivered by Barack Obama, “Victory Speech” and “Inaugural Speech”. The writer wanted to know the classifications of illocutionary acts occurring the utterances in the speeches of Barrack Obama, the frequency occurred of each classification in the speeches. In analyzing “Victory Speech” and Inaugural Speech”, the writer used Austin’s theory of speech Acts, Illocutionary Acts of Searle (1976). The findings showed that the five classifications of Illocutionary Acts with different frequencies used in both two speeches. Furthermore, it was revealed that the every classification was occurred in “Victory Speech” and “Inaugural Speech”, they are Representatives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives and Declarations. Finally, it was discovered that Obama in his speeches used several acts of each classification to transmit his message to the audiences, mainly in the way to assert the fact, tell his belief, promise some future actions, invite the audiences and declare something. The differences of Muskananfola’s study
(2009) with this study are the object, the problems of the study and the result. Muskananfola uses speech (Barack Obama), while this study uses movie (Akeelah and The Bee). Then the problems of the study, Muskananfola takes the types and frequent of illocutionary acts, while this study takes the types of illocutionary acts and the context of illocutionary acts. In the result of the study, Muskananfola has found the all of types of illocutionary acts, but in this study has found four of five types of illocutionary acts (directive, assertive, expressive and declarations).

The second is Liana salim (2006) in Faculty of Letters Petra Christian University Surabaya. The title is The Study of Illocutionary Acts in ‘Bed Cover’ Program of DJ FM Radio presented by Julian. Liana wants to analyze the illocutionary act types and most dominant types from presenter’s speech. The writer chooses the theory of illocutionary act types categorizes by Searle to analyze the illocutionary acts type of the utterance in the data. The methodology of this study is descriptive approach to analyze the data. The analysis shows that the data have representative (29 of the data (36.7%)), directive (30 of the data (38%)), expressive (24 of the data (24%)), and commissive (one of the data (1.3%)) types of illocutionary acts, and directive is the most dominant type in the data. The differences of Liana’s study (2006) with this study are the object, the problems of the study and the research method. Liana (2006) uses program of DJ FM Radio (Julian), while this study uses movie (Akeelah and The Bee). Then the problems of the study, Liana (2006) takes the types and most dominant of illocutionary acts, while this
study takes the types of illocutionary acts and the context of illocutionary acts. In the result of the study, Liana (2006) has used directive approach to analyze her study, while this study uses qualitative approach.

From the thesis above, the writer gets inspiration to her study. She wants to analyze “Akeelah and The bee” movie in linguistics study with using illocutionary acts theory. In this study, the writer takes theory of Searle (1979). She also chooses the types and the context of illocutionary acts as the problem of the study to make different from previous study and give useful for the students majoring in linguistic. So the writer in this study analyzes about illocutionary acts used by a main character in “Akeelah and the Bee” Movie by Dough Atchison.