CHAPTER II

THEORY & METHOD

2.1. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is referred to as a section that shows the theories applied to guide this study. It includes the definition of speech acts, the classification of directive speech acts, and the model of power and solidarity.

2.1.1 Speech Acts

Speech acts theory was first proposed by Austin et al. (1962), who argued that language is not merely used to describe reality but also to perform actions. Austin (1962) originally classified speech acts into three types: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. A locutionary act refers to the literal meaning of what is said. A perlocutionary act refers to the effect or response produced in the hearer as a result of the utterance. Meanwhile, an illocutionary act refers to the intended meaning behind an utterance.

2.1.2 Illocutionary Acts

Building on Austin's foundational work, Searle (1976) further developed the theory by classifying illocutionary acts into five categories, namely assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. Among these, this study focuses on directive speech acts, as they reveal the speaker's actual communicative purpose. As a unit of spoken language, illocutionary acts are

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

realized through verbal interactions between speakers and hearers, in which the speaker intends to influence the hearer's behavior.

2.1.3 Classification of Illocutionary Acts

As speech acts theory expanded, Searle (1976) categorized illocutionary acts into five distinct types: *assertive, commissive, declaration, expressive,* and *directive.* In this study, I concentrated on the directive illocutionary acts. As stated by Searle (1979), directive illocutionary acts are trying to get someone to do something. This means that the speaker has some power over what the hearer does. Following this, Searle developed other categories of directive illocutionary acts, namely *order, ask, permit, request, command, advice, invite, beg, pray,* and *entreat.* Therefore, this study only examined the categories of directive illocutionary acts that were used in the movie. The explanation for each category follows.

2.1.3.1 Order

An order is when someone tells another person what to do. It is similar to an instruction. By giving an order, they are basically telling someone what they need to do. This kind of communication shows the speaker's authority, while the hearer needs to obey the order. As such, the goal is that the completed activity in a way that corresponds with the speaker's wants. For example, when someone instructs "Give me a hamburger, medium rare, with ketchup and mustard, but easy on the relish" (Searle, 1979). The person who gets the order to make the hamburger has to do what the speaker asked for. If the person who

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

receives the order does not follow the instruction, then the hearer failed to perform the order (Searle, 1979).

2.1.3.2 Request

A request happens when someone speaks words that tell another person to do something. It is mainly asking them to do an action. A request is different from an order because the person listening is given a choice. If the speaker asks, it is possible for them to refuse the request. Searle (1979) suggested the example of a request, “Can you pass the salt?” When the speaker says that, it’s not merely asking a question but asking the hearer to pass the salt. A request works if the hearer and the speaker share the same goals and understand what is being said.

2.1.3.3 Asking

When someone wants some information from another person, they have to ask a question. In speech acts, this is what an asking is called. Febriany & Afriana (2025) found that asking is not just about getting information from someone; it is also a way to get the other person to do something. Asking usually appears in the form of a question, such as “Can you...?” and “Would you...?” Searle also pointed out that asking can be seen as a request in a polite way.

2.1.3.4 Command

A command is strong direct attempt where the speaker wants the hearer to take immediate action. Commands can be interpreted as the order that must happen. If the speaker has more power (general) told the hearer who has less

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

power (private) to “Clean the room” (Searle, 1976), it can be counted as a command. Therefore, a command needs to be obeyed.

2.1.3.5 Invite

The term invitation is described as a sentence that gives a proposal to someone to take a certain action. Usually similar to requests in a question form. An invitation happens when someone tells the listener to attend and be part of an event (Febriany & Afriana, 2025). For instance, someone might say, “Would you like to come to my birthday party?” in a nice way.

2.1.3.6 Advice

Advice is a description of directive speech acts that gives an opinion on what someone should do and how they should act in a particular situation. In response, the hearer is not obligated to obey the action. It can be accepted or rejected (Brown & Levinson, 1987). For instance, the phrase “You’re going to need a pair of boots” can be categorized as advice that also includes the information that it is good for them (W. & Nadhif, 2024).

2.1.4 Power and Solidarity

Among the factors that influence the behaviors of speech acts, I consider that power and solidarity are the important variables that influence the successful behaviors of directive speech acts. The concept of power and solidarity is introduced by Brown & Gilman. Brown & Gilman (1960) developed an influential analysis that interlocutors with different levels of hierarchy cannot have the same behaviors. As for power, the relationship is

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

called nonreciprocal, in that the speaker and the hearer are not in the same way caused by various backgrounds, such as wealth, sex, age, physical strength, and many roles in the type of work. In essence, someone who has more power would dominate the conversation rather than the one with less power.

Meanwhile, another concept introduced by Brown & Gilman (1960) is solidarity. Solidarity comes when there is a special connection or a feeling of closeness to someone, which hierarchies is no longer required. Brown & Gilman (1960) believed that the concept of solidarity is reciprocal; in other words, both interlocutors have mutual relations. Nevertheless, people with higher power may be solidary with people who have less power. For example, a parent-child relationship is caused by the emotional connection. Whether the power is higher or lower, it is not a tool to assume solidarity. However, a solidarity relationship arises when similar understanding of the interlocutors, such as political affiliation, place of birth, or other similar things (Brown & Gilman, 1960).

2.1.5 Illocutionary Forces Indicating Devices (IFIDs)

Illocutionary forces indicating devices typically indicate the function of an utterance. Yule (1966) described that IFIDs purposely make a statement, asking something, giving an order, expressing gratitude, or making a promise. One of the IFID's devices is when a performative verb can be explicitly identified through illocutionary acts. For instance, in the sentence, "I predict that" and "I warn you that" include the verbs "predict" and "warn." According to Yule

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

(1966), intonation, stress, and word order were other IFID's devices in order to convey the impact of illocutionary acts.

2.1.6 Felicity Conditions

Felicity conditions were an essential approach to understanding how the utterance was appropriate in a certain situation (Searle, 1979).

2.1.6.1 Preparatory Conditions

According to Searle (1979), preparatory conditions were believing that they were able to perform the actions, while the speaker wanted the hearers to actually do something. For example, the sentence "Could you close the window, please?" (Salsabila & Basuki, 2024) referred to an utterance that contains the possibility of the hearer's actions.

2.1.6.2 Propositional Content Conditions

Similarly, in directive speech acts, prepositional content conditions are described as future prediction of the speaker toward the addressee (Searle, 1979). The phrase "Carl, we can't cut the ending, we just can't" (Husna, 2019) is an example of the propositional content of felicity conditions.

2.1.6.3 Sincerity Conditions

Not only that, the third following of felicity conditions is the sincerity conditions. This type of speech act shows how utterances reflect the speaker's intention. To conduct this, the speaker should be genuine in uttering the intention to avoid being infelicitous (Searle, 1979). Dianit & Sofyan (2023)

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

identified that phrases like “We are very sorry for your loss” are examples of sincerity toward the hearer.

2.1.6.4 Essential Conditions

The last factor of felicity conditions is the essential conditions. Essential conditions come to completion from the previous factors, which interlocutors should know that the delivered utterance counts as an attempt to make the hearer do something (Searle, 1979). For instance, the phrase that meets the requirement of essential conditions is “Anyone besides the family there that night?” (Dianit & Sofyan, 2023).

2.2 Research Method

This section provides an overview of the research methods used in this study. I divided the chapter into several parts, consisting of types of research, data and data sources, population and sample, methods of collecting data, and methods of analyzing data.

2.2.1 Types of Research

This study employed a qualitative-descriptive approach to describe and analyze the data. The qualitative approach aims to explore and understand the meanings that individuals or groups attribute to social or human interactions (Creswell, 2014). This approach is suitable, as the data are analyzed descriptively based on the directive speech acts as the main focus of this study.

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

2.2.2 Data and Data Sources

The data source of this study is the movie *The* Proposal (2009), which can be accessed through https://www.disneyplus.com/en-pt/movies/the-proposal/iuM9ZBVHqcY7. Additionally, I used the English subtitle of the movie to ensure accuracy, as shown in the following link https://www.4subscene.com/subtitles/869508.

2.2.3 Population and Sample

The population data of this study includes all the utterances produced by the two main characters, Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton, throughout the movie *The Proposal*. Therefore, in this study, purposive sampling was employed as the sampling technique. According to Sugiyono (2013), purposive sampling is a strategy in which the researcher selects participants based on specific criteria. In this case, the sample of this study is the directive utterances produced by both characters, which were selected purposively based on their relevance to the research question.

2.2.4 Methods of Collecting Data

I applied a non-participant observation method to collect the data. The non-participant method refers to a method where the researcher observes and records social behavior without taking part in the activities with the participants (Williams, 2008). Furthermore, when collecting the data, it also involves observing the movie *The Proposal.*

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

1. First. I watched the movie, *The Proposal* (2009), on Disney Plus as shown in the following link https://www.disneyplus.com/en-pt/movies/the-proposal/iuM9ZBVHqcY7, and paid more attention to gain the directive utterances performed by Margaret and Andrew.
2. Then, I downloaded the transcript of the movie from 4subscene.com, which can be accessed through https://www.4subscene.com/subtitles/869508 to help check if the subtitles are accurate.
3. The next step was to create five columns in Excel to classify the data analysis, as shown in Table 1. The first column contains the stages of the movie, which group each scene according to the characters' development. The second column contains the name of the character who produced the utterance. The third column shows the name of the character to whom the character in the first column is receiving the utterance. The fourth column shows the utterances performed by the character. The fifth column identifies whether the utterance in the third column is a directive speech act or not. If yes, it is marked with a "v". I only analyze the utterance performed by Margaret and Andrew to limit the data.

Stage	Speaker	Addressee	Utterance	Directive Speech Ac
1	Margaret	Andrew	Cancel the call.	☑
1	Margaret	Andrew	Push the meeting to tomorrow.	☑
1	Margaret	Andrew	Keep the lawyer on the sheets.	☑
1	Andrew	Margaret	Have you finished the manuscript I gave you?	☑
1	Andrew	Margaret	Can I say something?	☑
1	Margaret	Andrew	Have security take his breakfront out of his offi	☑
1	Margaret	Andrew	And I need you around this weekend to help re	☑
1	Andrew	Margaret	Bergen and Malloy want to see you upstairs ir	☑

Figure 2.1. *Analyzing Data*

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

2.2.6 Methods of Analyzing Data

I employed a distributional method proposed by Sudaryanto (2015). This method is used to classify the directive utterances produced by Margaret and Andrew into specific categories. This discussion is divided into two parts when discussing the methods of analyzing data. The first part addressed the first research question, which then continued to the second research question.

2.2.6.1 Research Question 1

The first research question is "what types of directive speech acts are used by the main characters in the movie *The Proposal* (2009)?." After classifying the data in columns, I will start to analyze the utterances to determine whether they contain directive speech acts features by Searle (1979) or not, as shown in Table 2. To simplify the categorization, I added one more column that shows the categories of illocutionary force by Searle. Later on, I began to calculate the frequency of illocutionary force performed by Margaret and Andrew. To complete the analysis, each of the types of illocutionary force will be discussed in the findings and discussion section. Hence, this answers the first research question.

No	Stage	Speaker	Addressee	Utterance	Directive Speech Ac	Illocutionary Force
1	1	Margaret	Andrew	Cancel the call.	☑	Order
2	1	Margaret	Andrew	Push the meeting to tomorrow.	☑	Order
3	1	Margaret	Andrew	Keep the lawyer on the sheets.	☑	Order
4	1	Andrew	Margaret	Have you finished the manuscript I gave you?	☑	Ask
5	1	Andrew	Margaret	Can I say something?	☑	Request
6	1	Margaret	Andrew	Have security take his breakfront out of his offi	☑	Order
7	1	Margaret	Andrew	And I need you around this weekend to help re	☑	Order
8	1	Andrew	Margaret	Bergen and Malloy want to see you upstairs in	☑	Request

Figure 2.2 *Identifying Illocutionary Force*

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO

2.1 Research Question 2

The second research question is "how do directive speech acts reflect power relation between Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton, the two main characters in the movie *The* Proposal (2009)?." To present a clearer classification of the data, I added the seventh column in order to address the power between Margaret and Andrew in each stage of the movie. Later, the analysis was done by using the codes 'L' for low and 'H' for high to mark each character's power position, as shown in Table 3. Therefore, the second research question is addressed.

No	Stage	Speaker	Addressee	Utterance	Directive Speech Ac	Illocutionary Force	P-A/P-B
1	1	Margaret	Andrew	Cancel the call.	☑	Order	H - L
2	1	Margaret	Andrew	Push the meeting to tomorrow.	☑	Order	H - L
3	1	Margaret	Andrew	Keep the lawyer on the sheets.	☑	Order	H - L
4	1	Andrew	Margaret	Have you finished the manuscript I gave you?	☑	Ask	L - H
5	1	Andrew	Margaret	Can I say something?	☑	Request	L - H
6	1	Margaret	Andrew	Have security take his breakfront out of his offi	☑	Order	H - L
7	1	Margaret	Andrew	And I need you around this weekend to help re	☑	Order	H - L
8	1	Andrew	Margaret	Bergen and Malloy want to see you upstairs ir	☑	Request	L - H

Figure 2.3 *Identifying Power Relation*

PERPUSTAKAAN FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO