CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHOD

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This section presents the theories applied as the framework of the thesis, including the theory of illocutionary acts classification, directive illocutionary acts classification, IFIDs, felicity condition, and context.

2.1.1 The Classification of Illocutionary Acts

Searle (1979:12–20) classifies the categories of illocutionary acts into five categories, including *declarations, directives, expressives, commissives,* and *assertives.*

 Assertives or *representatives* have an effect to make the speaker become committed to the truth after saying the utterance. The verbs that are classified into this category are *state, submit, propound, maintain, say, assert, avow, allege, deny, affirm, indicate, declare,* and *claim* (Allan, 2014:199).

 Directives are the results of attempting the hearer to do something and it is characterized by verbs*, such as pray, beg, ask, insist, invite, implore, plead, petition, urge, solicit, tell,* and *summon.*

 Commissives have the objective to make the speaker become committed to some action in the future. The verbs that fall into this category are *vow, promise,* and *swear*.

The focus of the purpose of *expressives* is the psychological state, namely *deplore, condole, apologize, thank, welcome,* and *congratulate.*

Declarations are characterized by the alteration of status of the interlocutors after uttering the sentence, such as *accepting, rejecting, deciding,* and *forgiving.*

2.1.2 The Classification of Directive Illocutionary Acts

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985:198–205), the class of directive speech acts includes acts, such as the acts of *commanding, ordering, requesting, begging, pleading, praying, entreating, directing, asking, urging, telling, requiring, demanding instructing, prohibiting,* and *forbidding.*

1. *Requesting*

   The speaker requests the hearer to do something with the possibility of refusing. *Requesting* commonly has a polite or formal form of sentence and the speaker has a reason to request the hearer to perform an action.

   Example:

   i.   "I'd like this one, please." (Lailiyah, 2015:70)

   ii. "Will you kindly get off my foot?" (Allan, 2014:205)

2. *Forbidding*

   When the speaker forbids the hearer from doing something, it is categorized as *forbidding*. The characteristic of this type of *directives* is the use of the word 'not' in the utterance. According to Searle and Vanderveken (1979:202), *forbidding* is the propositional negation of ordering and is different from

prohibiting in terms of time. In *forbidding,* it is required for the speaker to have authority or power over the speaker and the hearer has the obligation to follow.

Example:

i. "Do not make a noise. Your sister is studying."

ii. "Stop playing around!"

3. *Suggesting*

Suggesting is the type of directive illocutionary acts which is classified as weak *directives* and has the possibility of refusal from the hearer. This type of *directives* is usually uttered by the hearer to suggest something that benefits the hearer.

Example:

i. "You should come early."

ii. "You should do your homework."

4. *Ordering*

This type of directive illocutionary act refers to the act of the speaker ordering the hearer to do something without giving a room for the speaker to refuse. Even though similar to *command* in terms of the need for the speaker to have an authority or a power, *command* and *order* are different. For *command*, the speaker has to be in a position of authority in an institutional structure, whereas *ordering* requires the speaker to be in a position of power, but not necessarily the institutionally structured one.

Example:

i. "Tell me your name." (Allan, 2014:205)

ii. "Read the book aloud."

5. *Asking*

This type of directive illocutionary acts has two different purposes, namely asking a question and asking someone to do something. Both purposes attempt to get the addressee to perform a speech act by uttering a question which can be marked by the use of wh-question forms or the tone of the speaker.

i. "What is your name?"

2.1.3 Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs)

This study uses Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) to recognize the intended illocutionary force. According to Yule (1996:49–50), the most explicit device to indicate the illocutionary force is performative verbs. Alternatively, devices, such as mood, word order, stress, and intonations can be used if there is no explicit mention of a performative verb in the utterance.

2.1.4 Felicity Conditions

Felicity conditions include propositional content condition, preparatory condition, sincerity condition, and essential condition (Searle, 1969:57–60).

1. Propositional Content Condition

   The intention of propositional content conditions is to express the judgment, opinion or matter to be addressed and is able to represent actual both future, past, and present state of affairs.

2. Preparatory Condition

This deals with circumstances that are required for the intended illocutionary to be successful, as well as dealing with the truth of the certain proposition in the context of utterance.

3. Sincerity Condition

    The sincerity condition concerns the psychological condition of the speaker.

4. Essential Condition

    This condition refers to the intention of the speaker to commit the action expressed by the utterance.

2.1.5 Context

The classification of context varies from one linguist to the other one, but Song (2010:876–877) classifies context into linguistic, situational, and cultural context.

The relationship between words, phrases, sentences, and even paragraphs within a discourse is known as the linguistic context. Three perspectives can be used to investigate linguistic context, namely deictic, co-text, and collocation. Next, situational context refers to the setting, time, location, and other details in which the conversation takes place as well as the dynamics amongst the participants. Last, cultural context includes the background, customs, and culture in which the speakers participate. Language is a social phenomenon that is closely correlated with the social structure and value system of society, so the influence of factors such as social status, social role, age, and sex to a language cannot be avoided.

2.2 Research Method

The method employed in this research is a descriptive qualitative method which aims to describe a phenomenon after collecting and analyzing word-based data. The data in this study is taken from a primary source which is the dialogues of Andrew Paxton who is a character in *The Proposal* (2009) movie. This American romantic comedy movie starring Ryan Reynolds as Andrew Paxton and Sandra Bullock as Margaret Tate is a movie produced by Touchstone Pictures, K/O Paper Products, and Mandeville Films for Walt Disney Studios Motion Pictures under the direction of Anne Fletcher as the director following the plot of the script written by Peter Chiarelli. The movie follows the story of Margaret and Andrew who initially work together as a boss and an assistant at Colden Books before agreeing to become a pretend couple so that Margaret can avoid her deportation.

The research population of this study includes all of the dialogues uttered by all characters in *The Proposal* (2009) movie which contains directive illocutionary acts. Purposive sampling technique is applied to distinguish the sample of the data which are consisted of Andrew Paxton's dialogues in talking to Margaret Tate that convey directive speech acts. Furthermore, this part will cover the method of collecting the data and the method of analyzing the data.

2.2.1 Method of Collecting Data

The data in this study are collected using the observation method which is considered one of the most prominent methods of research. According to Ciesielska et al. (2018:33), this method involves activities such as watching the

object of the research, evaluating intently, drawing conclusions, and giving comments on the relations and interactions that appear during the observation of the research object.

Based on that, the data collection of this study begins by downloading *The Proposal* (2009) movie from the MeetDownload website and the dialogue transcript from Drew's Script-O-Rama website. After that, the writer will read the dialogue transcript and highlighted the dialogues that could be included in the data. To confirm that the selected dialogues from the transcript are eligible to be categorized as directive illocutionary acts, the writer will watch the film to look into the context of the conversation between Andrew and Margaret.

2.2.2 Method of Classifying Data

The method used in classifying the collected data is the qualitative classification method, in which the writer classifies the data based on the kinds of directive illocutionary acts theory proposed by Searle and Vanderveken (1985:198–205), such as *commanding, ordering, prohibiting, begging, pleading, asking, praying, entreating, directing, requesting, urging, telling, requiring, demanding, instructing,* and *forbidding.* The data that have been collected will be classified according to the characteristic or markers that indicate an utterance belongs to a particular kind of directive illocutionary acts. For example, a *prohibiting* utterance is marked by the word 'not' in a sentence. Thus, the utterance needs to fulfill the requirement or characteristic of the type of directive illocutionary acts in order to be inputted into the classification. After that, the writer will check whether the

utterance is felicitious or not by looking into the propositional content conditions, preparatory conditions, sincerity conditions, and essential conditions of the utterance. An utterance that is felicitious is considered effective if it fulfills all of the felicity conditions.

2.2.3 Method of Analyzing Data

The data that have been collected and classified will be analyzed to address the research questions and aim to achieve the purposes of this study. To begin, the utterances of the data will be examined whether the utterance is produced when Andrew is in his role as Margaret's assistant or as her fiancé by observing the context during the time of speaking. For the second research question, the writer will compare the data of Andrew's directive illocutionary acts as an assistant and fiancé by describing the similarity and differences of the utterances. Next, the data will be analyzed further to find the correlation between the roles and utterances in order to address the third question whether Andrew's roles influence his directive illocutionary acts or not and explained descriptively.