



**ILLOCUTIONARY SPEECH ACT ANALYSIS IN MODERN
DRAMA *TRIFLES* BY SUSAN GLASPELL**

A THESIS

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for S-1 Degree Majoring Linguistics in the English Department,
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University**

**Submitted by:
Nurliana Dea Sapphira
NIM 13020117140097**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2022**

PRONOUNCEMENT

I honestly declare that I wrote this thesis myself without taking the work of other researchers from any tertiary institution, either at the diploma, S-1, S-2, or S-3 degree. I also ensure that I do not take any material from other works except the references already mentioned.

Semarang, 13 January 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nurliana', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nurliana Dea Sapphira

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

"Yesterday I was clever, so I wanted to change the world. Today I am wise, so I am changing myself."

Jalaludin Rumi

"Don't focus on the pain, focus on the progress."

Dwayne Johnson

*This thesis is dedicated to
My dad, mom, brother, grandparent, bestfriends,
and everyone who always support me*

APPROVAL
ILLOCUTIONARY SPEECH ACT ANALYSIS IN MODERN DRAMA
***TRIFLES* BY SUSAN GLASPELL**

Written by:

Nurliana Dea Sapphira
NIM: 13020117140097

Is approved by the thesis advisor

On 13 January 2022

Thesis Advisor



Dra. Wiwiek Sundari, M.Hum
NIP. 195906071990032001

The Head of English Department



Dr. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum
NIP. 196710041993031003

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata I Thesis Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

On March, 11th 2022

Chair Person,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Nurhayati' with a stylized flourish at the end.

Dr. Nurhayati, M. Hum

NIP. 196610041990012001

Member,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Dwi Wulandari' with a stylized flourish at the end.

Dwi Wulandari, S.S., M.A.

NIP. 197610042001122001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful, the writer pray and praise His presence, who has bestowed His grace and guidance so that the writer can complete this thesis successfully.

The deepest gratitude is sincerely presented to my thesis advisor, Dra. Wiwiek Sundari, M.Hum, who has taken her valuable time to patiently provide constructive suggestions and continuous guidance to help me completed the thesis successfully. I would like to give a greatest thanks these following people who always give me endless support.

1. Dr. Nurhayati, M. Hum, as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
2. Dr. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M. Hum, as the Head of the English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
3. Dwi Wulandari, S.S., M.A. as my academic supervisor
4. All Lectures of English Department, Diponegoro University who have given precious and valuable knowledge for the writer.
5. My dad and mom, Eddy Susanto and Sri Wulandari, also my brother, Fikri Adrian Saputra who always endlessly support and motivates me to fight.

6. My high school mate, Rohadatul Aisyi, Finny Annafisyah, Dyah Ratna, Malihatul Rosidah, Azalia Sulthana, who always support me through ups and down, share jokes, and give me advices.
7. My college buddies, Mita Nutriardanti, Alfi Mirza, Ade Putra, Dyah Putri, Foe Arnetta, Khusna Amalia, Khoirina Muqtafia, Naftali Feby, Nugrahaning Anindita who always encourage me.
8. My assignment partner, Risaffani Yasmin Pertiwi, Deta Russita, Nurul Aziza Safira Santoso, Zulfiana Nur Azizah, and Elisa Amany for the fun experience during our group assignment.
9. My friend in English Department batch 2017, especially class D who always share laughter and help me to learning together in class.

This thesis is still far from perfect and needs to be improved.

Therefore, I gladly receive any constructive comments and suggestions to make it better. I hope this thesis will be useful for everyone who reads it and study this field.

Semarang, 13 January 2022

Nurliana Dea Sapphira

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRONOUNCEMENT	i
MOTTO AND DEDICATION	ii
APPROVAL.....	iii
VALIDATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER I	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Research Questions	2
1.3. Purposes of Study	3
1.4. Previous Studies	3
1.5. Scope of the Study	6
1.6. Organization of Writing	6
CHAPTER II.....	8
2.1. Theoretical Framework	8
2.1.1. Pragmatics	8
2.1.2. Speech Act	9
2.1.3. Illocutionary Act	11
2.1.3. Type of Illocutionary Act	11
2.1.4. Perlocutionary Act	13
2.1.5. Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)	14
2.2. Research Method	15
2.2.1. Data and Data Resource	15
2.2.2. Method of Collecting Data	15
2.2.3. Method of Analyzing Data	16
2.2.4. Sampling Technique	16

CHAPTER III 18

3.1. Findings 18

3.1.1. Directive 19

3.1.2. Assertive 20

3.1.3. Expressive 20

3.2. Discussion 21

3.2.1. Illocutionary Act of the County Attorney 21

3.2.2. Illocutionary Act of the Sheriff 27

3.2.3. Illocutionary Act of Mr. Hale 29

3.2.4. Illocutionary Act of Mrs. Hale 30

3.2.5. Illocutionary Act of Mrs. Peters 34

CHAPTER IV 39

REFERENCE 41

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3. 1 Type of Illocutionary Act Found in the Drama	18
---	----

ABSTRACT

Drama is one of literary genres that can deliver a message to the audience because it consists of conversations. The author will discuss Susan Glaspell's Drama entitled *Trifles* and this thesis will analyze the illocutionary speech act which is contained in the drama. The writer uses the Speech Act theory by J.R. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) and also uses Searle's concept of illocutionary speech act categories such as declarative, assertive, expressive, directives, and commissive. The writer conducted this research using qualitative method and purposive sampling to analyze the data. Metode Simak is used by the writer to collect the data by paying attention to the language used by the characters. The analysis shows that there are 3 types of illocutionary speech acts in this drama. The kinds of illocutionary speech act performed by the characters are directive, assertive, and expressive speech act. Social background and relationships between characters are related to the appearance of directive, assertive, and expressive speech acts in the character's conversation.

Keywords: Speech Act, Illocutionary Speech Act, Utterance, Directive, Assertive, Expressive.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

In the modern literature era, many writers created new literary works such as drama, poetry, and prose. The writer usually creates literary works in accordance with what they want to devote and in accordance with the conditions when they live in the modern era. One of the most popular literary works in the modern era is drama. Drama is a representation of a fictional character that is displayed through dialogue and appearance. Drama is a genre of literature, which is an imitation of several actions.

Trifles is the most well-known one-act drama in modern literature generation. This is Susan Glaspell's play and first shown by Provincetown Players at the Wharf Theater, Provincetown, Massachusetts on August 8th, 1916. In her original performance, Glaspell played as Mrs. Hale. This drama is often made anthology in American literary textbooks. The story was begun with several neighbors entering the Wrights' farmhouse to reveal the murder case of John Wright. John's wife, Minnie, is the suspected murder.

Many people still watch and see the drama *Trifles* until today, but not everyone understands every word spoken by the character at the time of the drama performance. Drama becomes more fun because there is a dialogue that can be seen and heard by the

audience. By watching drama, we can find out the implicit meanings and moral messages that are useful for life.

The study of meaning in context is the essence of pragmatics, but it is difficult to identify or show context in speech. In fact, the language context of each literary work can be felt in the text but not all the time because to understand someone's literary works have different thoughts in the cultural context that are not found in the text. Therefore, paralinguistic and extra-linguistic instructions, especially with pragmatic approaches, can link meaning with related contexts delivered by speakers. The conversation has recently become the focus of interest in applying speech act theory and several proposals have been formulated regarding the possibility of extension speech act theory for conversation analysis. Regarding speech acts, there are conversations spoken by the characters in this drama *Trifles*. The author chose this drama as the object of study because there are conversations that have hidden messages and meanings. From these conversations, the writer finds different responses from each character. The author is interested in examining the illocutionary acts performed to find out the reaction.

1.2. Research Questions

Based on the background of the study, there are two issues to be discussed:

1. What are the Illocutionary Speech Act types of the character's conversation contained in the story?
2. How does Illocutionary Force affect the type of Illocutionary Speech Act of the character's conversation?

1.3. Purposes of Study

Based on the research question described by the author, the objectives of this study are:

1. To find out the Illocutionary Speech Act type of the character's conversation contained in the story.
2. To find out the effect of Illocutionary Force in every Illocutionary Speech Act type of character conversation.

1.4. Previous Studies

There are ten previous projects related to the speech act analysis.

The first one is a pragmatic paper entitled *An Application of Speech Act Theory to Some Romanian Orthodox Sermons* (Alina, 2010) which analyzed linguistic elements that enable the illocution force in Romanian orthodox preaching, especially in the discourses of several important figures who have influenced and still influence Romanian orthodox theology and religious life in Romania. The writer conducted the research used Austin's illocutionary force and Searle's taxonomy of illocutionary acts.

The second one is a journal entitled *An Analysis of Construction Performing the Speech Acts of Requesting and Begging* (Nuria, 2011). She studied the semantic and pragmatic basis of a number of illocutionary constructions that performs the speech act of asking and begging inside the scope of the Lexical-Constructional Model that was expanded by Ruiz de Mendoza and Baicchi.

The third one is a journal entitled *Speech Act Analysis to Short Stories* by Sahar (2011), which studied the speech act of three short narratives in the communication carried out by the characters using Searle's speech act classification.

The fourth one is a journal entitled *Speech Act Analysis of Anton Chekhov's The Seagull* by Mojgan Yarahmadi and Narges Olfati (2011). The writer tries to explore Speech Act Theory to be the sophisticated personality of different characters in drama and build the relationship between speech act and dramatic discourse. An attempt was also made to clarify the illocutionary power of linguistic utterances and the perlocutionary effect on the listener using Searle's typology of speech acts.

The fifth one is a thesis entitled *Tracking Hate Speech Acts as Incitement to Genocide in International Criminal Law* (Shanon, 2012). Her study is an attempt to find out the case drawn by many commentators in the field of international criminal law, the trial of the media executive for the role they played in the Rwandan genocide through public speeches by media entities insulting ethnic groups.

The sixth one is a thesis entitled *The Analysis of Illocutionary Acts Used by the Main Characters in Endgame Drama by Samuel Beckett* (Sakdiyah, 2014). The aim of this study is to find the types of illocutionary acts in Samuel Beckett's drama entitled Endgame also the functions of illocutionary acts. The author focuses on using the theory of illocutionary acts that have been conceptualized by Searle and Austin.

The seventh one is a journal entitled *The Warning of the Six Antitheses: A Speech Act Analysis of Matthew 5:21-48* by Nathaniel (2015). In his study, he focused on the actions performed in uttering the antitheses, action, and effect

accomplished by speaking the antitheses and used Austin and Searle's philosophical principle of speech act.

The eighth one is a thesis entitled *Directive Speech Act Analysis in Kung Fu Panda 3 Movie* by Erma (2017). She showed the kinds of directive speech act and the forms of directive speech act contained in the movie and applied Yule's speech act classification, classification of directive speech acts, form of directive speech act, and Hymes' context of situation theory.

The ninth one is a journal entitled *Speech Act Analysis on Walt Disney Film Entitled 'Frozen'* (Sukasih and Kustinah, 2018) discussed the types of speech act contained in the film used Searle's classification of illocutionary act to analyze the data.

The last one is a journal entitled *Speech Act Analysis of the Dialogues in Henshaw's This is Our Chance* by Samaila Yakubu (2021). The objective of this study is to identify the extent to which communicative goals are reflected in the structure of away message language and letters are analyzed for use non-standard orthography and humor. The writer used Austin's speech act theory and later developed by J.R. Searle.

All of the previous researches are focused on analyzing the speech act using Austin and Searle's theories in pragmatic field. From previous research that discussed the theory of illocutionary speech act, the author found several studies that focused on drama scripts to find the illocutionary acts contained in the drama script. The thing that distinguishes previous research from this research is that the author will identify the illocutionary force that causes illocutionary acts to appear in the story.

1.5. Scope of the Study

In conducting research with a pragmatic approach, the writer chooses the modern drama *Trifles* by Susan Glaspell as the object of research and apply the Speech Act theory by J.L. Austin (1962) through the concept of speech act categories and illocutionary force written in a book by J.R. Searle and Daniel Vanderveken (1985). The writer focuses on two aspects, classifying and analyzing the illocutionary act according to Searle's concept of Illocutionary Act and the illocutionary force which determines how the utterance is supposed to relate to the world in the drama script of the *Trifles* character's utterance.

1.6. Organization of Writing

This thesis consists of four chapters systematically so that the reader is easy to understand and read.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It consists of background of the study, research question, purpose of study, previous studies, scope of the study, and organization of writing.

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHOD

It points theoretical framework that explains the theory used in analyzing research problems, the theory consists of Pragmatics Theory, Searle's Concept of Speech Act, Austin's Concept of Illocutionary Act, and Illocutionary Force.

There is also information about the research approach, data collection methods, and steps, as well as methods and steps in analyzing data.

CHAPTER III

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

It describes the results of the research obtained based on data analysis with the theory used.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

It shows the conclusions from the results of data analysis obtained from the study.

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHOD

2.1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a study that studies the relationship between language and context that is fundamental to the understanding of language context (Levinson, 1983:21). To understand the meaning of someone's language, a speaker is required to also know the conclusions than only the meaning of words between words but also draw conclusions that will connect what is said with what is assumed, or what has been said before. It takes consideration of how the speaker organizes what they want to say exactly who they are talking to, where, when, and in what situations.

Leech (1983:6) describe pragmatics as the study of meaning relevant to the condition of speech. This means that we are dealing with pragmatics if one or more aspects of the speech situation are met. Next, he defines pragmatics as problem solving from both the speaker and the listener. The problem that speakers faced is planning about the way to build a speech that will cause the outcome reasonably. From the listener's point of view, the difficulty is interpretive, the listener must portray the main reason why the speaker says the utterance.

As Mey stated (2001:4-5), the steps of using language in various and unconventional ways are found in pragmatics. What's important is that the person knows what they are doing to convey their goal. Widdowson (1996:61) also added that pragmatics is involved in what people mean by the language they use or how they realize their meaning as a communicative source. This studies expressions in an actual speech in certain contexts to get the expected point in communication since people might not recognize what is meant by expressions.

2.1.2. Speech Act

Black (2005:17) asserts that speech act not only refers to perform of speaking but also to the whole communicative case, including the context of speech (situation where the discourse occurs, the participants and any previous verbal or physical interaction) and paralinguistic features that can contribute to meaning interaction. Searle (1969:16) states that speech acts that contain in utterance of sentences in general are a function of the meaning of the sentence. The meaning of the sentence does not in all cases specifically detect what speech is done in the utterance, because a speaker may be more meaningful than what he actually says, but in principle, it is always possible to say exactly what he means.

J.L. Austin was the first to introduce the idea of speech acts, defining speech acts, actions performed by the language to change the state of the object on which the action is performed done which is discussed in his book *How to Do Things with Words*. The

author represents an action that is effectively indicated by a sentence. Searle and Austin argue that in the same way that we perform physical actions, such as eating or closing doors, we can also perform actions using language. We can use language, for example, give commands, create requests, give warnings, or give advice. They call it a speech act. So, people who do things with words the same way they do physical activity.

According to Verharr (in Revita, 2014: 3) speech act in the utterance of a sentence contains the principle of the possibility to state incorrectly what is meant by the speaker. This relates to the strategy to make the speech partner do or not do something in accordance with what the speaker said. Grundy (2008:71) said that speech acts are language as actions. The act of speaking, which explores the nature of performative speech, is how speech delivered to one another has power and purpose. There is an aim as the content of what people say which is then conveyed through language with the power to get meaning in speech.

Furthermore, Austin (1962:98-101) says that speech act consists of three related actions. First, locutionary act is the actions taken to say something. This is related to meaning. The speech partner notes the meaning as the use of language with certain understanding and reference. Second, illocutionary act is the actions taken in saying something. These actions are identified by explicit performatives. Third, perlocutionary act is the action taken as a result of speech. We produce certain consequential effects on the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience or speaker through our statement.

2.1.3. Illocutionary Act

Searle (1985:1) stated that illocutionary act is a minimal human unit communication made by the communicative points of a speech. Illocutionary act is the actions taken by the speaker in saying something, not because it has produced certain effects by stating something. For example, if people say "I request you to go with me." The effect is that they have taken the order action, just because they have said the words, depending on the recipient will act in the appropriate way or not. Every illocutionary act has a certain 'illocutionary force'. It can be explicitly indicated by the use of performative verbs such as beg, promise, command, suggest, congratulate, or thank you, or certain forms of grammar implicitly, in this case, it must be concluded that most are based on contextual evidence. For certain illocutionary acts to function normally, usually a definite case the contextual conditions need to be fulfilled. This condition is known as a felicity condition.

2.1.3. Type of Illocutionary Act

Whereas Searle (1985:182) stated based on various criteria, illocutionary act is divided into five main types namely declarative, assertive, expressive, directive, and commissive:

2.1.3.1. Declarative

Declarative speech acts have an immediate effect on changing institutional circumstances and those that tend to depend on complicated extra-linguistic institutions. Some examples include isolating, revealing war, baptizing, marrying, and

discharging from work. In order to create an appropriate statement, the speaker must have power and primary representation in a particular condition. To make a declaration appropriately, the speaker must have a special role in a particular context. This action is usually carried out by someone who specifically has the authority to carry out several actions' such as judges who impose sentences on violators.

2.1.3.2. Assertive

Assertive speech act is used to binds the speaker to truth of the proposition expressed. Some examples are confirming and concluding. Leech (1983:105) proposes examples of these actions such as presenting, revealing, advising, boasting, criticizing, and insisting. This action is used by the speaker to represent the situation (Finnegan et.al, 1997:344). In speaking assertive, the speaker expresses his belief that some propositions are true. The speaker describes what the speaker believes about, such as describing, claiming, hypothesizing, insisting, and predicting (Cutting, 2008: 14).

2.1.3.3. Expressive

Expressive speech act will describe and expresses a psychological state. This action serves to express or know the psychological attitude of the speaker towards a situation that is assumed by illocution. The psychological state can be a statement of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joys, or sorrows experienced by the speaker.

2.1.3.4. Directive

Directives are actions that are used by the speaker to make the other person do something. Some examples such as asking and questioning. The purpose of this action

is to produce several effects through actions on the listener. Directive uses by the speaker to make the listener do some action by ordering, asking, advising, and recommending. The speaker also tries to get the listener to take action based on what the speaker wants.

2.1.3.5. Commissive

Commissive are actions taken to bind the speaker with some future action. By saying commissive, the speaker is committed to several actions that will be taken in the future, such as assuring, warning, swearing, rejecting, and suggesting. Commissive express what the speaker wants to promise or attach something in the future.

2.1.4. Perlocutionary Act

Yule (2008:48-49) in his book *Pragmatics* argued that perlocutionary act is an utterance that has the function to have an effect. Perlocutionary act is the listener's behavioral response to the meaning of speech, not only a physical or verbal response but also a mental or emotional response. In perlocutionary act, there is an effect of influence. The speaker tries to influence the listener to do what he wants to do. The perlocutionary act is the listener's reaction to the speaker's utterance. Thus, an utterance can cause the listener to do something. In addition, perlocutionary acts are actions to influence listeners such as humiliating, intimidating, persuading, and so on (Nadar, 2003:15). Examples such as alerting the listener by warning the listener about danger, persuading the listener by declaring supporting facts, intimidating listeners by threatening, and so on.

Example:

Carla: "I think I might go and have another hamburger."

Titan: "I was going to get another one."

Reina: "Could you get me a French fries with the
cheese sauce?"

Titan: "Me, too."

As we can see from the example, that is the result of the words. Carla get up and bring a French fries with cheese sauce each for Titan and Reina. This condition is called perlocutionary effect. What has been done by saying a word has an effect on the listener.

2.1.5. Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)

Illocutionary Force is determined uniquely after the illocutionary point, the condition of preparation, the way in which the illocutionary point is achieved, the condition of the propositional content, the condition of sincerity, and the degree of strength of the condition of sincerity are determined. (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985:20). Furthermore, Searle (1969:30) argues that illocutionary force indicator shows how the proposition should be taken, or in other words what illocutionary means and power the utterance has. Included in the illocutionary force indicating devices in English are: word order, stress, intonation contours, punctuation, mood of the verbs, and performative verbs. In actual speaking situations, the context is to explain what is meant by the illocutionary power of speech, without the need to use the appropriate explicit illocutionary force indicator.

2.2. Research Method

2.2.1. Data and Data Resource

The primary data from this study are drama scripts. There are 148 utterances spoken by the character of *Trifles* drama as the data resource. Because this is a descriptive qualitative approach, the data is in the form of language units, such as words, phrases, clauses, or sentences. Data was collected from utterances performed in dialogue by characters in the drama. The writer decides to choose this data because the writer can watch the drama comprehensively to get depth understanding and it will make it easier to analyze the primary data. The writer also tried to find out the language unit related to research objectives. The writer also writes and classifies the data based on the type of speech acts of Searle.

2.2.2. Method of Collecting Data

I used *Metode Simak* (Sudaryanto, 2015) to collect the data, by paying attention to the language used by the characters of the *Trifles* drama. As said by Sudaryanto (2015: 203) that *Metode Simak* is a method used in language research by listening to the use of language on the object to be studied. To get the data with *Metode Simak*, I used *Teknik Simak Bebas Cakap* (Sudaryanto, 2015). The writer did not participate in the conversation at all with his partner. This technique is carried out if the research data is in the form of written data or documents and the writer only uses overhear the conversation of two or more people. The data were dialogue containing illocutionary acts that are spoken by the characters in *Trifles*. The writer also uses a video

performance of the drama *Trifles* as secondary data. The data is in the form of utterances from the character that contain aspects of the speech act. Data collection techniques are done by looking at the conversation scripts in the drama *Trifles* and watching the original drama performances of *Trifles* to better understand the drama's storyline.

2.2.3. Method of Analyzing Data

The data analysis procedure starts when the writer collects data. After that previous step, data is classified and analyzed into the category of speech acts they have. Then, the authors specify and portray the information to solve the objectives research. This research was conducted using a pragmatic approach and using qualitative methods. Qualitative method is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written words or quotes from people and their observed behavior (Bogdan and Taylor in Moleong, 2004: 4). Data were analyzed using context analysis to draw conclusions by objectively finding message characteristics. Data analysis was performed qualitatively, in this study does not involve numerical and statistical measurements.

2.2.4. Sampling Technique

I used purposive sampling technique to analyze the data. Arikunto (2006) stated purposive sampling is a technique of taking samples not based on random, but based on considerations that focus on certain goals. Researchers have determined sampling

by setting special characteristics that are in accordance with the research objectives so that they are expected to be able to answer research problems. The population in this study is the drama script of *Trifles* and the sample that I will take is a drama script that contains an illocutionary act.

CHAPTER III

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Findings

The writer finds various kinds of illocutionary acts in the dialogue of *Trifles* drama. The most common type of illocutionary act is directive, which has occurred 37 times since the characters in this drama tried to uncover a murder case occurred in someone's house. The characters ask a lot about what happened before the murder case and invite them to look for clues that can be used as evidence. It can be seen from their conversation that they ask about the family background of the victim and many invite them to look for clues at the scene of the murder.

Table 3. 1 Type of Illocutionary Act Found in the Drama

No.	Type of Character	Name of Character					Total
		County Attorney	Sheriff	Mr. Hale	Mrs. Hale	Mrs. Peter	
1.	Expressive	5	1	1	6	3	16
2.	Assertive	1	2	1	11	9	24
3.	Directive	21	2	-	10	4	37

4.	Commissive	-	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Declarative	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total						77

From the table, it can be seen that the type of illocutionary act that often appears is directive which occurs 37 times. This drama contains many directive speech acts. It is because the drama characters are investigating a murder case occurred in a house, so they ask each other and ask their interlocutor to do what the speaker did to solve this case. Meanwhile, the type of illocutionary act that is rarely used is expressive which occurs 16 times. The characters also express their curiosity when they are uncovering a murder case. Commissive and declarative illocutionary acts do not appear in this drama because the characters do not perform speech acts that show them to declare and commit in future actions.

3.1.1. Directive

The directive speech act is aimed to make the listener do something with different intentions. The speaker expresses what they want then someone does something that the speaker wants. Mostly, the directive speech act found in this drama script asks the interlocutor to do what the speaker says or answer what the speaker asks.

This illocutionary act type is the most frequently found in the script. We can see from the table that the District Attorney, Sheriff, Mrs. Hale, and Mrs. Peters performed this

speech act to investigate a murder incident at an abandoned farmhouse. They asked each other to do what they want in order to solve the murder case.

3.1.2. Assertive

Assertive is the way the speaker states about the things they believe in. This type of illocutionary act is intended to convey about the situation that is happening to the listener. The statements stated in the form of facts, assertions, conclusions, and descriptions. The representative type also appears a lot in the script because the characters tend to have beliefs and arguments toward what they believe and they think the arguments are true.

All the character performed assertive speech act to convey their beliefs and argument in investigation of murder case. Each character had a different argument in undergoing the investigation. The male characters, County Attorney, Sheriff, and Mr. Hale argued that evidence and clues from the murder case can be found easily and tended to underestimate Mrs. Hale's argument. Unlike the male characters, Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters had an argument that insisting small and trivial things could be the cause of the murder case.

3.1.3. Expressive

Expressive is a speech act performed by the speaker by stating what the speaker feels. In performing expressive speech act, the speaker does not make a condition suitable for words or words suitable to describe a situation, but the truth of the proposition expressed is assumed by the speaker. Expressives are used to express the psychological

condition of someone and can be in the form of statements such as happy, pain, likes, dislikes, and sorrows.

From the data shown in the table, the cast of the drama performed an expressive speech act, so they could express their feelings and their psychological condition. In the investigation place, they showed their feelings of like, dislike, cranky, and sorrow. The man character had a different psychological condition with the woman character. Since the men always dominated in the investigations, they showed expressions of dislike with the scene of a murder and were arrogant because they thought it will be easy to get evidence of a murder incident. Unlike the man, the women in this drama showed expressions of dislike for the boys because they were belittled just because they were a woman. Because of their dislike for men, they did not want to reveal anything that could be evidence of the murder.

3.2. Discussion

3.2.1. Illocutionary Act of the County Attorney

The County Attorney is one of the five main characters in the drama. He has to investigate a murder case that happened on the Farmhouse with the Sheriff. The kind of illocutionary act performed by the County attorney is directive, assertive, and expressive. Illocutionary acts presented by the County Attorney have a different illocutionary force in each category.

Data 1:

County Attorney: *“By the way, has anything been moved? Are things just as you left them yesterday?”*

Sheriff: *“(looking about) It's just the same. When it dropped below zero last night I thought I'd better send Frank out this morning to make a fire for us—no use getting pneumonia with a big case on, but I told him not to touch anything except the stove—and you know Frank.”* (Glaspell, 1916:1)

The conversation above presents the County Attorney performing an illocutionary speech act in the form of a directive act. It purposed to ask the listener to do something that the speaker wants, also to make the listener answer the questions by the speaker. County Attorney purposed to ask for a piece of information from the sheriff about the case when he arrived at the crime scene. The sheriff as the interlocutor can understand the aim of questions given by The County Attorney, therefore he answers what happened the day before. The county attorney's utterance has an illocutionary force to ask and a normative form in the form of an interrogative form because it aims to pose a question to get information about the events of the John Wright murder case and what the Sheriff has observed.

Data 2:

County Attorney: *"Well, Mr. Hale, tell just what happened when you came here yesterday morning."*

Mr. Hale: *"Harry and I had started to town with a load of potatoes. We came along the road from my place; and as I got here, I said, 'I'm going to see if I can't get John Wright to go in with me on a party telephone....'"* (Glaspell, 1916:1)

The dialogue above also shows the directive act presented by the County Attorney. He wants to ask for an explanation from Mr. Hale as John Wright's neighbor and the witness of that murder case. The utterance has the illocutionary force to command and

has an imperative form because he asks Mr. Hale to give him some information about the condition of the murder's location and the strange condition of John Wright's wife. With the illocutionary force to command, the speaker succeeded in making the interlocutor say something that was asked by the speaker.

Data 3:

County Attorney: *"I'd like to talk more of that a little later. I want to get the lay of things upstairs now." (He goes to the left, where three steps lead to a stair door)*

Sheriff: *"I suppose anything Mrs. Peters does'll be all right. She was to take in some clothes for her, you know, and a few little things. We left in such a hurry yesterday."*

County Attorney: *"Yes, but I would like to see what you take, Mrs. Peters, and keep an eye out for anything that might be of use to us."*

Mrs. Peters: *"Yes, Mr. Henderson." (Glaspell, 1916:4)*

Directive art that is presented by County Attorney is purposed to ask Mrs. Peters to look and search the clues from the murder case. County Attorney wants to make sure and look at the condition on the upstairs so they can get the clues So, the sheriff gives County Attorney a recommendation. The sheriff suggests Mrs. Peters help them too. With the illocutionary force to command and the imperative form, Mrs. Peters accepts the command from County Attorney and the sheriff.

Data 4:

County Attorney: *"Oh I guess they're not very dangerous things the ladies have picked up. **No, Mrs. Peters doesn't need supervising. For that matter, a sheriff's wife is married to the law. Ever think of it that way, Mrs. Peters?"***

Mrs. Peters: *"Not just that way."*

Sheriff: "*Married to the law. I just want you to come in here a minute, George. We ought to take a look at these windows.*" (Glaspell, 1916:10)

This utterance is an example of the assertive act since the County Attorney gives his opinion. He thought that Mrs. Peters is involved with the law because she is Sheriff's wife. His opinion gets a negative response from Mrs. Peters and Sheriff. What has been said by the County Attorney has an illocutionary force to state in interrogative form. It can be seen from the county Attorney's style of speaking which states something and asks his opinion.

Data 5:

County Attorney: "*I guess before we're through she may have something more serious than preserves to worry about.*"

Mr. Hale: "*Well, women are used to worrying over trifles.*"

[The two women move a little closer together.]

County Attorney: "*And yet, for all their worries, what would we do without the ladies?...*" (Glaspell, 1916:3)

This Assertive act presents County Attorney who gives an opinion and a prediction about what happened in the Farmhouse. He predicts that there is something to be worried about aside from her preserves. Mr. Hale gives a response to the County Attorney's opinion, and he agrees that women tend to be more worried about small and simple things. Also, women are easily snapped. The County Attorney's utterances is containing illocutionary force to predict with a declarative form, so those assertive acts can be related to Mr. Hale.

Data 6:

County Attorney: "*To be sure. And yet, I know there are some Dickson county farmhouses which do not have such roller towels.*"

Mrs. Hale: "*Those towels get dirty awful quick. Men's hands aren't always as clean as they might be.*" (Glaspell, 1916:3)

County Attorney's utterances to Mrs. Hale are a form of assertive act. The County Attorney argues that he knows there is a Farmhouse that doesn't have a roller towel. Those utterances get a negative response from Mrs. Hale. She criticizes County Attorney's perfectionism. There is an illocutionary force to state and has a normative form in declarative form because he argues about something that he believes is right in County Attorney's utterances

Data 7:

County Attorney: "*And yet, for all their worries, what would we do without the ladies?*" (the women do not unbend. He goes to the sink, takes a dipperful of water from the pail and pours it into a basin, washes his hands. Starts to wipe them on the roller towel, turns it for a cleaner place) *Dirty towels!* (kicks his foot against the pans under the sink) *Not much of a housekeeper, would you say, ladies?"*

Mrs. Hale: "*There's a great deal of work to be done on a farm.*" (Glaspell, 1916:3)

Those County Attorney's utterances are included the type of expressive act. The County Attorney express his aggravation because there is no cleaned towel and none of the housekeepers that maintain and clean the Farmhouse. Then the complaint is responded to by Mrs. Hale and she tells about the reason why there are no housekeepers in there. The illocutionary force from County Attorney's utterances is to complain of a vocative form.

Data 8:

County Attorney: "I'm going to stay here a while by myself. You can send Frank out for me, can't you? I want to go over everything. **I'm not satisfied that we can't do better.**"

Sheriff: "Do you want to see what Mrs. Peters is going to take in?"

County Attorney: "**Oh, I guess they're not very dangerous things the ladies have picked out.** No, Mrs. Peters doesn't need supervising. For that matter, a sheriff's wife is married to the law. Ever think of it that way, Mrs. Peters?" (Glaspell, 1916:10)

Included in the expressive act, County Attorney expresses his upset because he didn't get a clue from the Farmhouse's murder case. Sheriff tries to understand the County Attorney's intention, then he offers him help, therefore Mrs. Peters could help them too. The Sheriff's idea is responded by County Attorney. He thinks that it will be dangerous for women, so there is a possibility if she accepts the offer. The illocutionary force from County Attorney's utterances is to complain about a declarative form because he will ask Frank to come to the Farmhouse.

Three types of the illocutionary act being performed by the County Attorney have different purposes. Those illocutionary acts are related to the County Attorney's obligation to investigate the murder case, his view during investigating the Farmhouse, and his upset because he failed to get any clue from the murder case. Also, from County Attorney's utterances, it can be seen that he disrespects women, so he gets an unpleasant response from women. Every kind of Illocutionary act that is delivered has a different kind of illocutionary force. It depends on the response of the interlocutor.

3.2.2. Illocutionary Act of the Sheriff

The Sheriff is also the main character in the drama. He and the County Attorney are involved to investigate the murder case of John Wright on the Farmhouse. Unlike County Attorney, the Sheriff is not dominating the conversations although he has power in the investigation. Kinds of the illocutionary act presented by the Sheriff are directive, assertive, and expressive acts.

Data 9:

Sheriff: "*Do you want to see what Mrs. Peters is going to take in?*"

County Attorney: "*Oh, I guess they're not very dangerous things the ladies have picked out. No, Mrs. Peters doesn't need supervising. For that matter, a sheriff's wife is married to the law. Ever think of it that way, Mrs. Peters?*"
(Glaspell, 1916:10)

The directive act that is said by the Sheriff definitely has the purpose to make the interlocutor can responding the speaker correctly. The Sheriff is asking if County Attorney needs help in that investigation. According to County Attorney, it might be a good idea because it will not make the women in danger. There is an illocutionary force invitation with interrogative form in those utterances and purposed for the Sheriff's aim can be understood by the County Attorney.

Data 10:

Sheriff: "*Married to the law. I just want you to come in here a minute, George. We ought to take a look at these windows.*"

County Attorney: "*Oh, windows!*"

Sheriff: "*We'll be right out, Mr. Hale.*" (Glaspell, 1916:10)

The illocutionary act that shows in the Sheriff's utterances is an example of a directive act. The Sheriff asks the County Attorney to follow what he has been said. The Sheriff asks the County Attorney to look at the windows and then the Sheriff is going out because his investigation has been finished. There is an illocutionary force from the response of the County Attorney responding to the Sheriff's utterance. It is presented in the form of an invitation with a declarative form.

Data 11:

Sheriff: *"It's just the same. When it dropped below zero last night, I thought I'd better send Frank out this morning to make a fire for us..."*

County Attorney: *"Somebody should have been left here yesterday."*

Sheriff: *"Oh yesterday. When I had to send Frank to Morris Center for that man who went crazy I want you to know I had my hands full yesterday...."*
(Glaspell, 1916:1)

Both utterances that have been said by the Sheriff are types of assertive acts. A few days before, the Sheriff is going to report the incident when he comes to the Farmhouse. When the County Attorney asks about the condition of the house again, he reports that he wants to send Frank because the Sheriff is busy on the day before. Illocutionary force that contained in the Sheriff's utterances is to report with a declarative form.

Data 12:

Sheriff: *"Well, can you beat the women! Held for murder and worryin' about her preserves."*

County Attorney: *"I guess before we're through she may have something more serious than preserves to worry about."* (Glaspell, 1916:3)

The utterances that have been said by the Sheriff in those conversations are included in the expressive act. Sheriff says that he is dissatisfied at not having found the killer and asked if they could find the culprit. He was eager to know the culprit who was worried about her preserves. The sheriff's statement has an illocutionary force to command with a vocative form so that the sheriff's intent to arrest the perpetrator can be understood by the county attorney.

The three categories of speech acts being performed by the Sheriff have different aim. The illocutionary act that appears is related to his duty to investigate the murder case with the County Attorney, his observations when he arrived at the farmhouse the previous day, and also his dissatisfaction at not having found the perpetrator of the murder and the women character who care too much about trivial things.

3.2.3. Illocutionary Act of Mr. Hale

Mr. Hale is one of the characters who had a role as a farmer. He is also John Wright's neighbor and his farmer fellow. Mr. Hale's role as the witness from the chronology of this incident when he came to the house and how the condition of John Wright's wife. Mr. Hale is not the main character or a character who dominating, because the kind of illocutionary acts that are presented are only assertive and expressive acts.

Data 13:

County Attorney: "*And how did she look?*"

Mr. Hale: "*Well, she looked queer.*"

County Attorney: "*How do you mean queer?*"

Mr. Hale: "*Well, as if she didn't know what she was going to do next....*"
(Glaspell, 1916:2)

The utterances that have been said twice by Mr. Hale are the form of the assertive act. Mr. Hale is going to report what he has been seen when he comes to Wright's house. Also, he reports that he saw Mr. John Wright's wife who looked weird. The report that has been said by Mr. Hale makes County Attorney eagars lookout for the information with more detail. There is an illocutionary force with a declarative form that is used for the information delivery. It can make the County Attorney wants to know the clue from that murder case.

Data 14:

Mr. Hale: "*Well, women are used to worrying over trifles.*"

[The two women move a little closer together.]

County Attorney: "*And yet, for all their worries, what would we do without the ladies?...*" (Glaspell, 1916:3)

The expressive acts that have been said by Mr. Hale are purposed to express the truth of the proposition that is assumed by the speaker. He expressed his opinion on the traits of the women while expressing his dissatisfaction as the investigation progressed. From Mr. The hale, Mrs. Hale and Mrs. Peters feel offended that they unite. Mr. The hale contains an illocutionary force to complain in a vocative form to convey what he feels.

3.2.4. Illocutionary Act of Mrs. Hale

Mrs. Hale is one of the woman characters in this drama. She is Mr. Hale's wife and John Wright's neighbor. During living as neighbor to John Wright, she was never close

to his wife and never visited his home. She only knew a few things about John Wright's wife and had joined Mrs. Peters. The type of illocutionary act that is presented in Mrs. Hale's utterances are directive, assertive, and expressive.

Data 15:

Mrs. Hale: "*Do you think she did it?*"

Mrs. Peters: "*Oh, I don't know.*"

Mrs. Hale: "*Well, I don't think she did. Asking for an apron and her little shawl. Worrying about her fruit.*" (Glaspell, 1916:5)

Utterances that have been said by Mrs. Hale are examples of the directive act. Asking something to the speech partner (interlocutor) and making the speech partner (interlocutor) answer what was asked before is the purpose of Mrs. Hale. She asked Mrs. Peters to ascertain whether John Wright's wife did it, the question was answered by Mrs. Peter clearly, therefore she can confirm to Mrs. Hale. Mrs. Hale's utterances to Mrs. Peters have an illocutionary act to ask with an interrogative form to get the appropriate answer.

Data 16:

Mrs. Hale: "*Oh, Mrs. Peters—it's—*"

Mrs. Peters: "*It's the bird.*"

Mrs. Hale: "*But, Mrs. Peters, look at it! It's neck! Look at its neck! It's all other side to.*"

Mrs. Peters: "*Somebody wrung its neck.*" (Glaspell, 1916:8)

Mrs. Hale asks to look at the bird that tied is the example of the directive act. Mrs. Hale sees Mrs. Joh Wright's bird tied to his neck and asks Mrs. Peters to look at that. From

that request, Mrs. Peters then directly does Mrs. Hale's command and looks at the thing that they found. There is an illocutionary force to invite someone with a declarative form in Mrs. Hale's request.

Data 17:

Mrs. Hale: "*She liked the bird. She was going to bury it in that pretty box.*"

Mrs. Peters: "*When I was a girl my kitten there was a boy took a hatchet, and before my eyes and before I could get there. If they hadn't held me back I would have hurt him.*"

Mrs. Hale: "*I wonder how it would seem never to have had any children around. No, Wright wouldn't like the bird a thing that sang. She used to sing. He killed that, too.*" (Glaspell, 1916:9)

The statement made by Mrs. Hale in the quote above is a form of assertive act. She stated what was known about John Wright's wife while they were looking for clues to the murder case. All that Mrs. Hale knew is that she likes the birds that sing sweetly. For her, she feels like she is a bird, she likes to sing with a sweet voice. The illocutionary act contained in the speech is to assert with a declarative form so that Mrs. Peter also got a glimpse of John Wright's wife.

Data 18:

Mrs. Hale: "*Those towels get dirty awful quick. **Men's hands aren't always as clean as they might be.***"

County Attorney: "*Ah, loyal to your sex, I see. But you and Mrs. Wright were neighbors. I suppose you were friends, too.*"

Mrs. Hale: "*I've not seen much of her of late years. I've not been in this house, it's more than a year.*" (Glaspell, 1916:3-4)

The form of the assertive act said by Mrs. Hale is to express her opinion. She wants to express it since previously the County Attorney is annoyed because of using a dirty towel. Mrs. Hale also thinks that the men's hands are not always clean. Then this idea gets an unpleasant response from the County Attorney, and then he continues to ask Mrs. Hale. The utterances of Mrs. Hale are included to Illocutionary force to state in a declarative form.

Data 19:

Mrs. Hale: "*Wright was close. I think maybe that's why she kept so much to herself. She didn't even belong to the Ladies Aid. I suppose she felt she couldn't do her part, and then you don't enjoy things when you feel shabby. She used to...*"

Mrs. Peters: "*She said she wanted an apron. Funny thing to want, for there isn't much to get you dirty in jail, goodness knows. But I suppose...*" (Glaspell, 1916:5)

The prediction that has already been said by Mrs. Hale is included in the form of an assertive act. She wants to know, why John Wright's wife is a closed person and never socializes with others. Then appear a prediction of why did she become a closed person and discuss this topic with Mrs. Peters. These utterances have the illocutionary force to predict in a declarative form, therefore Mrs. Hale's utterances can be understood by Mrs. Peters.

Data 20:

Mrs. Hale: "*I'd hate to have men coming into my kitchen, snooping around and criticising.*"

Mrs. Peters: "*Of course it's no more than their duty.*"

Mrs. Hale: "*Duty's all right, but I guess that deputy sheriff that came out to make the fire might have....*" (Glaspell, 1916:4)

The expression of Mrs. Hale's dejection is an example of an expressive act. After the gents check the kitchen, then they go upstairs to check the condition. Mrs. Hale expresses her dejection because she doesn't like someone who comes to the kitchen and then criticizes the condition in the kitchen. The illocutionary act that appeared on those utterances is to complain about a vocative form.

Data 21:

Mrs. Hale: "*It would, wouldn't it? But I tell you what I do wish, Mrs. Peters. I wish I had come over sometimes when she was here. I wish I had.*"

Mrs. Peters: "*But of course you were awful busy, Mrs. Hale your house and your children.*"

Mrs. Hale: "*I could've come. I stayed away because it weren't cheerful and that's why I ought to have come but it's a lonesome place and always was. I wish I had come over to see Minnie Foster sometimes*" (Glaspell, 1916:7)

The form of this expressive act is purposed to express regret about something that cannot be replaced or rewind. Mrs. Hale is regretting his past time when she was not close with John Wright's wife, or even visit their house. After she is knowing the motif of the murder, she just already knows the reason why John Wright's wife killed John Wright, also why did she so closed. The utterances that have been said by Mrs. Hale is containing an illocutionary force to deplore in a vocative form.

3.2.5. Illocutionary Act of Mrs. Peters

Mrs. Peters is one of the female characters in the drama. She is the wife of the sheriff who is investigating a murder case. Trying to investigate the motive for the murder

with Mrs. Hale, they did it their way by investigating John Wright's wife's possessions and trying to predict it. The type of illocutionary act performed by Mrs. Peters on the conversation in the drama is directive, assertive, and expressive.

Data 22:

Mrs. Peters: *"Why, here's a bird-cage. Did she have a bird, Mrs. Hale?"*

Mrs. Hale: *Why, I don't know whether she did or not. I've not been here for so long. There was a man around last year selling canaries cheap..."* (Glaspell, 1916:7)

Questions uttered by Mrs. Peters are an example of a directive act. The speaker can request or ask about information so that the interlocutor explains the desired information, and it is the purpose of the directive speech act. The women are investigating John Wright's wife's possessions while predicting the motive for her murder. Mrs. Peters wanted to know whether he had birds or not and he asked Mrs. Hale, explained by Mrs. Hale what he knows about her bird cages and the bird. With an illocutionary force to question in an interrogative form, Mrs. Peters was successful in getting his point across to Mrs. Hale

Data 23:

Mrs. Peters: *Well, I must get those things from the front room closet, (she goes to the door at the right, but after looking into the other room, steps back) You coming with me, Mrs. Hale? You could help me carry them.*

[They go in the other room; reappear, Mrs. Peters carrying a dress and skirt, Mrs. Hale following with a pair of shoes.] (Glaspell, 1916:5)

Mrs. Peters expression above is also an example of a directive act. The speaker aims to ask his interlocutor to do something that has been asked by the speaker. Mrs. Peters wanted to tidy up the messy front room cupboard, so she asked Mrs. Hale to help her carry things. The women work together to tidy up the messy things. Mrs. Peters has an illocutionary force to invite with an interrogative form so that Mrs. Hale accepted his invitation.

Data 24:

Mrs. Peters: *"I don't think we ought to touch things."*

Mrs. Hale: *"I'll just finish up this end (Suddenly stopping and leaning forward)..."* (Glaspell, 1916:7)

Mrs. Peter's utterances above are an example of the assertive act. Someone must be having their argument and purpose to represent a state of affairs. According to Mrs. Peters, it wasn't a good thing when people held other people's belongings without permission, so he reminded Mrs. Hale that is better off not touching other people's stuff. There is an illocutionary force to suggest with a declarative form in the speech spoken by Mrs. Peters.

Data 25:

Mrs. Peters: *"Mr. Peters says it looks bad for her. Mr. Henderson is awful sarcastic in a speech and he'll make fun of her sayin' she didn't wake up."*

Mrs. Hale: *"Well, I guess John Wright didn't wake when they were slipping that rope under his neck."* (Glaspell, 1916:5)

Mrs. Peters' utterances shown in the dialogue above are examples of the assertive act. Someone can express his or her opinion about describing a person or someone's

personality. She thinks that Mr. Henderson or the County Attorney is a sarcastic person, therefore he thought it is funny if John Wright's wife was sleeping when her husband is killed. Mr. Peters is a careful and understanding person, and because of that, he thinks that it will be dangerous for Mr. John Wright's wife. To express the assertive act above, there is an illocutionary force to assert in a declarative form.

Data 26:

Mrs. Peters: *"But I'm awful glad you came with me, Mrs. Hale. It would be lonesome for me sitting here alone."*

Mrs. Hale: *"It would, wouldn't it? But I tell you what I do wish, Mrs. Peters..."*
(Glaspell, 1916:7)

The utterances that have been said by Mrs. Peters above are an example of the expressive act. Someone will express what they feel towards the condition. Mrs. Peters feels happy because Mrs. Hale is also coming to the Farmhouse. Sitting alone and waiting for the gents to finish the murder case investigation made her feel lonely. She feels lonely because she is alone. Those 'happy' utterances contain illocutionary force to command in a vocative form.

Data 27:

Mrs. Peters: *"It was an awful thing was done in this house that night, Mrs. Hale. Killing a man while he slept, slipping a rope around his neck that choked the life out of him."*

Mrs. Hale: *"His neck. Choked the life out of him."* (Glaspell, 1916:9)

Expressions of concern from Mrs. Peters are an example of the expressive act. After knowing the motive of the murder that took place at the Farmhouse, the women felt concerned and regretful. They felt pity and sorry after knowing how John Wright's wife felt and it made her kill her husband. Mrs. Peters has an illocutionary force to explore in a vocative form so her goal is to convey what she feels can be conveyed.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

From the analysis result that has been carried out through qualitative descriptive methods and based on related theories, the author finds two important things related to the application of illocutionary speech acts in the drama *Trifles* by Susan Glaspell. First, the researcher found 3 types of illocutionary speech acts.

The author of the drama created five main characters who perform illocutionary speech acts in drama performances. The most common illocutionary acts were directive speech acts which occurred 37 times, followed by assertive speech acts which appeared 24 times, and expressive speech acts which appeared 26 times.

The reason why there are only 3 types of illocutionary acts, namely because the characters do not show declarative speech acts that aim to change conditions through utterances and commissive speech acts to bind someone to future actions. The characters perform a directive speech act to ask someone to do something the speaker wants, an assertive speech act to state a statement that is believed to be true, and an expressive speech act to express the feelings felt by the speaker.

From the three types of illocutionary speech acts, each has a type of delivery of illocutionary speech acts. Speech acts by the County Attorney, Sheriff, and Mr. Hale point out that they work together on homicide investigations and tend to underestimate the role of women in trivial matters, even if they find no clues in the end. Meanwhile,

the illocutionary speech act shown by Mrs. Peters and Mrs. Hale expressed their frustration that women were being underestimated by men. The ladies also worked together to investigate the case in their own way so that they could find out the motive for the murder from Mrs. Wright's strange items.

This study concludes that the illocutionary speech acts in Susan Glaspell's drama *Trifles* were successfully conveyed by providing a message shadow and detailed intention in each utterance between the conversations carried out by the five main characters. Each process included in the data shows and finds various types of illocutionary acts as described above.

REFERENCE

- Arikunto, S. 2006. *Metodelogi penelitian*. Yogyakarta. Bina Aksara.
- Altikriti, S. F. 2011. "Speech Act Analysis to Short Stories". *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 2(6).
- Black, Elizabeth. 2005. *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburg. Edinburgh University Press
- Duffy, G., & Frederking, B. 2009. "Changing the rules: A speech act analysis of the end of the Cold War". *International Studies Quarterly*, 53(2), 325-347.
- Erma, N., & Kurniawan, S. S. 2017. "Directive Speech Act Analysis in Kung Fu Panda 3 Movie (Pragmatics Approach)". Doctoral dissertation, IAIN Surakarta.
- Fyfe Shannon. 2017. "Tracking hate speech acts as incitement to genocide in international criminal law." *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 30(2), 523-548.
- Gioroceanu, Alina. 2010. "Illocutionary Force and Romanian Orthodox Sermons: An Application of Speech Act Theory to Some Romanian Orthodox Sermons". *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 6(2), 341-359.
- Heal, J. 2013. "Illocution, Recognition and Cooperation". *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes*, 87, 137-154.
- Levinson, Stephent C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Martínez, Nuria del Campo. 2011." A Constructional Approach to The Expression of Illocutionary Meaning: An Analysis of Construction Performing the Speech Acts of Requesting and Begging". *Revista Española De Lingüística Aplicada*, (24), 43-60.
- Moeschler, J. 2002. "Speech act theory and the analysis of conversation". *Essays in speech act theory*, 77, 239-262
- Nastri, J., Peña, J., & Hancock, J. T. 2006. "The construction of away messages: A speech act analysis". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(4), 1025-1045.
- Revita, I. 2013. "Pragmatik: Kajian Tindak Tutur Permintaan Lintas Bahasa". Padang. *Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Andalas*.
- Sakdiyah, F. 2014. "Analysis of Illocutionary Acts Used by The Main Characters in Endgame Drama by Samuel Beckett". Doctoral dissertation UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

- Searle, J. R., Vanderveken, D., & Willis, S. 1985. *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.
- Searle, J. R. 1985. *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Siebel, M. 2003. Illocutionary acts and attitude expression. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 26(3), 351-366.
- Simmons, N. 2015. "The warning of the six antitheses: A speech act analysis of Matthew 5:21-48". Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Widayanti, S. R., & Kustinah, K. 2018. "Speech Act Analysis on Walt Disney Film Entitled 'Frozen' (A Pragmatic Study)". In *Fourth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics (Prasasti 2018)*. Atlantis Press.
- Yakubu, S. 2021. "Speech Act Analysis of the Dialogues in Henshaw's This Is Our Chance". *Journal of Critical Studies in Language and Literature*.
- Yarahmadi, M., & Olfati, N. 2011. "Speech act analysis of Anton Chekhov's "The Seagull". *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*.
- Yule, G. 2010. *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

