

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

This chapter presents the theories that underlie the analysis of this research. The theories that are employed in this research are the theory of Pragmatics, taken from Yule (1996) and Levinson (1983), Discourse theory is taken from Cook (1994), Speech Acts theory is taken from Brown and Yule (1984), Searle (1969), the theory of Locution, Illocution and Perlocution taken from Austin (1970), and last is the theory of conflict taken from Pickering (2001).

The theory of Pragmatics is used to analyze the speaker's meaning and sentence meaning, how the meaning of a sentence is generally assumed to be derived from the meaning of its words. Speech Acts theory is used to give the understanding about Speech Acts and further explanation about Speech acts and its levels of actions. The theory of Locution, Illocution and Perlocution is used to give the understanding about each term. Then theory of conflict is used to analyze the categories of conflict and thing that causes conflict.

Review of Related Theories

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication (Yule, 1995: 4). Pragmatics is about how people make sense of each other linguistically, but it can be a complicated area of study because pragmatics requires us to make sense of people and what they have in mind.

There are some definitions of Pragmatics that come from some Linguists, such as:

a. George Yule

◆ **Pragmatics is the study of speaker's meaning**

In his book entitled *Pragmatics*, George Yule stated that Pragmatics concerns with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader) (Yule, 1996:3). Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning as distinct from word or sentence meaning (Yule, 1996:133). From the definition, we know that Pragmatics deals with the intended meaning of an utterance, not exactly or simply the same with the grammatical meaning of the utterance. Example: The security officer of bank said to a customer, "This is not a public area." From the security officer's utterance, the intended meaning is not just informative to explain that the place is not a public area, but beyond that utterance, the intended meaning is "You may not enter this area, only certain persons can enter the area."

◆ **Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning**

This means that Pragmatics is a study about the situation that the speaker should fulfill to be succeeding in communication or in the other words; Pragmatics is a study about the importance of situation around the speaker, when the speaker apply his language. Context, in this case, may include place, time, social status, participants and culture. Example: A conversation between a student and a teacher in a history class.

Student: "Excuse me, sir, would you explain more about Albert Tasman's journey?"

Teacher: "Sure. Which part that you do not understand?"

From the conversation we know that if the context of place is formal places we should use formal language.

◆ **Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said**

It means that Pragmatics study about the unpredictable possibility that could happen when we hear or utter a language with other people, in this case the impact or the intention of an utterance. Example: A teacher is teaching in the class and the air conditioner was turned off for several minutes. The teacher then feels that the temperature becomes steamy and

he said, “It’s hot here.” If the students can catch the intended meaning of their teacher, they may open the door and the windows to get more fresh air, so the class will be cooler. But if the message was fail, the students will not open neither the door nor the windows, but may only say, “Yes, it’s hot here” without any reactions of opening the door or windows.

◆ **Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance**

Pragmatics studies how the social relationship affects the speaker’s utterances. Example: Dave is as a lawyer and Steve is a judge. They are close friends. However, when they meet inside the court, they will greet each other using the title. Dave calls Steve Your Honor and Steve calls Dave “Mr. Johnson”. It means that the social distance affects their language. Since Dave’s position in the court is considered lower than Steve, Dave must use more polite and formal language when talking to Steve in the court; although outside the court as close friends, they may speak to each other using informal language.

◆ **Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms**

It means that the users’ status determines what kind of utterances they will utter. Gender could determine the linguistic forms that will be determined by a language user. There are linguistic forms that can only be used by men and there are also linguistic forms that can only be used by women. Example: “*Hey, babe!*” is proper to be uttered only by men. When a woman says this word to a man, she will be considered as “naughty woman”, which can be considered impolite, because woman’s utterance is usually more polite than a man.

From various definition of Pragmatics that George Yule stated, the writer sees that the definition that suits this research is the first definition which is Pragmatics is the study of speaker’s meaning; and the third definition, which is Pragmatics is the study of how more get communicated than is said.

- b. Jacob L. Mey in his book *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (1993:42) says that Pragmatics is the study of the conditions of human language uses as these are determined by the context of society”.
- c. In his book *Pragmatics*, Stephen C. Levinson (1983:21) added that Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. Pragmatics can be defined as a study talking about the relationship between language and context.

2.2. Discourse

In his book *Discourse and Literature* (1994), Guy Cook states that Discourse is the study of what it is that makes texts meaningful and coherent for their users. Discourse, as opposed to text, is a stretch of language in use, taking on meaning in context for its users, and perceived by them as purposeful, and connection is known as ‘coherence’. Discourse analysis is the study and the explanation of this quality of coherence. A discourse is a coherent stretch of language. Discourse analysis has focused much upon the social nature of communication, stressing contextual aspects of meaning which are interactive and negotiated, determined by the social relations and identities of the participants in communication. In Discourse approach, the writer only focuses on speech act.

2.2.1. Speech Acts

A speech act is an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance, including the following: a general act (Illocutionary act) that a speaker performs, an act involved in the illocutionary act, including utterance acts and propositional acts, the production of a particular effect in the addressee (Perlocutionary act). Speech acts is the action between the speaker, who talks, and the hearer, who listens to the speaker. Speech acts theory provides a means of probing beneath the surface of discourse and establishing the function of what is being said.

Austin described three characteristics, or acts, of statements that begin with the building blocks of words and end with the effects those words have on an audience. Locutionary acts: “roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with

a certain ‘meaning’ in the traditional sense.” Illocutionary acts: “such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking; i.e. utterances which have a certain (conventional) force.” Perlocutionary acts: “what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading”

There are five classifications of acts in Illocutionary Acts, namely Representatives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives, and Declaratives.

- ◆ Representatives describe some state of affairs. Speaker conveys his beliefs that some proposition is true. This type includes arguing, asserting, boasting, claiming, complaining, criticizing, denying, describing, informing, insisting, reporting, suggesting, swearing, etc.

e.g.: I met your parents yesterday. → informing

You’d better change your clothes. → suggesting

- ◆ Directives are attempts to get Hearer to do something; therefore they express Speaker's wish or desire that Hearer do. The acts are advising, asking, begging, challenging, daring, demanding, forbidding, insisting, inviting, ordering, permitting, recommending, requesting, suggesting, etc.

e.g.: Could you pass the salt? → requesting

Don’t go to that party! → forbidding

- ◆ Comissives is the statement that has a function as promises or refusals or action. The acts included accepting, betting, committing, guaranteeing, offering, promising, refusing, threatening, volunteering, vowing etc.

e.g.: Do you want to go with us tomorrow? → offering

I will be there at 5 o’clock. → promising

- ◆ Expressives is the expression of “psychological state” of Speaker about something, so the purpose of it is to express the feeling and emotion of the Speaker. The acts are apologizing, complimenting, condoling, congratulating, deploring, praising, regretting, thanking, etc.

e.g.: I’m really sorry about yesterday. → apologizing

I like your house very much. → praising

- ◆ Declaratives is a statement that when it is uttered, it brings a new state of being. The acts of declaratives are approving, betting, blessing, christening,

confirming, cursing, declaring, disapproving, dismissing, excommunicating, naming, nominating, resigning.

e.g.: I now pronounce you husband and wife. → declaring

I quit from this job. → resigning

Austin maintained that once “we realize that what we have to study is not the sentence but the issuing of an utterance in a speech situation, there can hardly be any longer a possibility of not seeing that stating is performing an act”. This conclusion stated his belief that studying words or sentences (Locutionary acts) outside of a social context tells us little about communication (Illocutionary acts) or its effect on an audience (Perlocutionary acts).

A. Locutionary Acts

Locutionary act is the basic act of the utterance of producing a meaningful linguistic expression (Yule, 1996). In performing a Locutionary act, a speaker uses an identifiable expression, consisting of a sentence or sentence fragment from language, spoken with identifiable prosody. Prosody is the study of patterns of sounds and rhythms in poetry and speech (Oxford 2nd Ed, 1995). Normally, a locution demands that speaker and hearer have knowledge of the grammar, lexicon, semantics, and phonology of language.

Austin says that the interpretation of Locutionary acts is concerned with meaning. In other words, a Locutionary act is an act of producing a meaningful linguistic expression. In a simple way, Locutionary act is the meaning of what a speaker says. For example: “I’d like to order cappuccino.” Then the Locutionary act is the speaker wants to order cappuccino.

Austin also included the act of referring as part of the Locutionary act, and they were first separated by Searle in *Speech Acts* (1969). Whereas locutions are defined on a particular language, reference is defined on particular worlds. Different speakers using different Locutionary and utterance acts can refer to the same thing. For instance, at a gathering in which there are speakers of English (1), Indonesian (2), Javanese (3) and Mandarin (4), are all referring to the same food.

- (1) This food is so delicious.
- (2) Makanannya lezat sekali.
- (3) Panganane enak tenan.
- (4) Na chi fan hen hao chi.

Obviously, under normal conditions of use, speaker makes an utterance, uses a locution, and refers with it, all at one and the same moment.

B. Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary act is forming an utterance with some kind of function in mind (Yule, 1996). An Illocutionary act is a complete speech act, made in a typical utterance, that consists of the delivery of the propositional content of the utterance (including references and a predicate), and a particular illocutionary force where the speaker asserts, suggests, demands, promises or vows.

John Searle claims the illocutionary act is “the minimal complete unit of human linguistic communication. Whenever we talk or write to each other, we are performing illocutionary acts”. Illocutionary acts are performed with intentionality (on purpose). Illocutionary act is communicatively successful if the speaker’s illocutionary intention is recognized by the hearer. For example, a speaker may say “Shut the window” intending for the auditor to understand this communication as an order and further intending that the auditor should shut the window. According to Searle, a speech act may have any number of effects on the auditor other than those intended by the speaker.

In utterance, Speaker performs an Illocutionary act in using a particular locution to refer, such that utterance has the Illocutionary Force of a statement, a confirmation, a denial, a prediction, a promise, a request, and so forth. For example, a speaker might say, “Shut the window,” and the auditor might respond by saying, “Shut it yourself.” From this, Searle claims that the “fact that illocutionary acts are basically intentional, since Perlocutionary acts may or may not be intentional, is a consequence of the fact that the illocutionary act is the unit of meaning in communication”.

Sometimes it is rather difficult to describe whether an utterance is belongs to Illocutionary Act or the Perlocutionary Act, since both depend on the

context (who is talking to whom, when and where the sentence is uttered).it is not impossible that one Locutionary Act might seem to have more than one Illocutionary Act and Perlocutionary Act. Therefore, the previous utterance should be concerned in order to grasp the appropriate act.

C. Perlocutionary Acts

Perlocutionary Act, according to Austin, is what someone does by saying it. Speaker's Perlocutionary act is act of achieving a particular Perlocutionary effect on the hearer as a result of hearer recognizing (what he/she takes to be) the locution and illocutionary forces in an utterance. A Perlocutionary act is a speech act that produces an effect, intended or not, achieved in an addressee by a speaker's utterance. So, in other words, a perlocution is hearer's behavioral response to the meaning of the utterance, not necessarily a physical or verbal response, perhaps merely a mental or emotional response of some kind. Other perlocutions are such things as: alerting hearer by warning hearer of danger; persuading hearer to an opinion by stating supporting facts; intimidating hearer by threatening; getting hearer to do something by means of a suggestion, a hint, a request, or a command; and so forth.

An effect of utterance which does not result from hearer recognizing the locution and illocutionary point of an utterance is not a perlocutionary effect, but some kind of gestures effect (e.g. responding to a raised voice or an angry look). Perlocutions are extremely significant within a theory of communication because the normal reason for speaking is to cause an effect in hearer, and speaker typically strives to achieve this by any means he/she can. For example, the writer formulated a conversation as follows:

Situation: Michael, Wen Wen and Linda are sitting together in the cafeteria.

Wen Wen: "I will get another cup of tea."

Michael: "I was going to get one too."

Linda: "Could you please get me a glass of water?"

The perlocutionary effect of Michael and Linda's utterance is Wen Wen gets up and brings Michael and Linda a cup of tea and a glass of water.

2.3. Conflict

In any conversation, there must be an argument or conflict. No matter how small or even big the conflict, it is still called a conflict. Conflict is a reason(s) offered for or against something; a discussion in which there is disagreement, dispute and debate (Webster's New World: College Dictionary 4th Ed). Verbal conflict is recognized as a distinctive speech activity by participants and observers. In verbal conflict, participants oppose the utterances, actions or selves of one another in successive turns at talk (Grimshaw, 1990). In verbal conflict, participants usually place themselves in symbolic positions that are opposed to one another. Conflicts include disagreement, challenge, denial, accusation, threat and insult.

Daniel Webster defined conflict as follows:

- ◆ Opposition or emulation between incompatible party one another.
- ◆ Behavior or situations which interfere in (for example: different idea, opposition or importance between individual).
- ◆ Dispute effect of requirement, motivation, desire, or demand which interfere in.
- ◆ Animus.

Categories of Conflict

In his book *How to Manage Conflict*, Peg Pickering (2001) categorized conflict into four.

A. Self Conflict

Self conflict is emotion trouble that happened in someone self, because him claimed to finish a work or fulfill an expectation whereas experience, enthusiasm, target of and arrange its value do not ready to fulfill demand, so that this matter become burden for him. Self conflict expresses difference between what you tell, wishing and what you do to realize that desire. Self conflict pursues everyday life and even can causes people who loss their mind do not know what to do.

B. Conflict Between Individual

Conflict between individual is a conflict between two persons. Everybody has four psychological basic needs which could trigger conflict when is insatiable. The four psychological basic needs are the desire to be esteemed and considered as human being, the desire hold to conduct, the desire have high self-regard and the desire for being consistence.

1) The Desire to be Esteemed and Considered as Human Being

All of us wish others confess our prestige and also esteem us and the tiring which we give. That is why appreciation represents motivation appliance which is powerful. We like if praised for having completed a work better and esteemed to the mind contribution which we give. When we feel unappreciated or we are exploited by other people, it means our desire to be esteemed have been impinged. That collision triggers reaction in the form of having cold feet or fulminate.

2) The Desire to Hold Conduct

Holding conduct is everybody's desire and at some people, this desire can be monstrous. One who has ambition to hold conduct basically has no self confidence. The greater someone have self confidence, the smaller the desire to control others.

3) The Desire of Having Pride

A high pride is a strong base to face various type of situation. Pride is the key for our ability to give answer, not to react. Responding a problem is positive approach, in control and orient to solve problem. Reaction is negative step and imprecise often, full of emotion and mindlessly.

4) The Desire for Being Consistence

When you have taken an explicit attitude concerning a problem and do not change your mind again, it will be difficult to you to change attitude and confess you were wrong. The desire to be consistent along with the desire to be right for the shake of saving one's face, becoming an important factor in every conflict.

C. Conflict in Group

Conflict in group is conflict that happened between individual in a group (team, departmental, etc).

D. Conflict Between Groups

Conflict between groups involves more than one group (some departments, teams, organizations). Group aspect adds the complication of conflict. Everyone does not only have to overcome conflict in himself and self conflict between him with others, but he also has to deal with the overall of interaction with all the people involved. Conflict between group is the most serious and complicated conflict to a company. Each time the conflict becomes hotter and spread among the group, rumor and gossip will bring chaos which finally destroy you and your company.

Conflict will not happen if there is nothing that triggers it. There are some things that can cause conflict in a daily conversation, such as:

1. Communication failure
2. Personality conflict
3. Value differences
4. Goal differences
5. Methodological differences
6. Substandard performance
7. Lack of cooperation
8. Differences regarding authority
9. Differences regarding responsibility
10. Competition over resources
11. Non-compliance with rules

Conflict Phase Identification

Conflict can be handled effectively if you apply effective certain handling strategy. Conflict consist of various phase and each phase involve emotion at certain intensity and level. If conflict can be identified early on and

steps are immediately taken to improve the situation and calm the emotion, almost every conflict can become opportunity. If we let conflict unhandled, it has potency to generate danger at all people in concerned. There are three phase of conflict:

1. Everyday Small Problem and Dispute

This is the conflict which does not threaten the parties involved. This phase is marked by small things which annoying that happened every day. To handling it can be used various means overcome conflict.

2. A Bigger Challenge

This phase, in a long term, brings impact and triggers larger emotion because it contains competition, based on win or lose attitude. Defeat at this phase felt very big since everybody involved face this problem as personal problem. Self interest and saving self face is very important. The atmosphere at this phase is not always marked by inimical attitude, but is marked by awareness attitude. Insult, insinuation and jeer is used by self defense tactics at this phase.

3. Open Fight

Even good man can generate loss at others if he is controlled by emotion and if its desire to win is bigger than its desire to punish. At this phase, the purpose shift from wishing to win to wishing to hurt. The motivation is to eliminate the rival.

Review of Related Studies

- 1) For this research, the writer uses a related study of *A Speech Act Analysis on the Miscommunication Between Ben and Katie Jordan in "The Story of Us"* which was done by Nancy Octavia in 2001. This study is very useful for the writer to see the methodology that Nancy Octavia used. Besides that, the writer can also use some of the review of related literature that Nancy uses and moreover the writer is inspired by the idea of Nancy's study.

The Story of Us tells about a couple, Ben and Katie Jordan, who has been married for fifteen years, but now they want to get divorce because there are a lot of miscommunications between them. Ben, who works as a worker, often cannot understand what Katie wants from him. The same thing happens to Katie (who works as a reporter). She often wonders why Ben cannot understand what she expects him to do.

This research is quite different from Nancy's study. This research analyzes the three distinctive levels of Speech Acts (Locutions, Illocutions and Perlocutions) that cause conflict which occurred in the conversation between the two main characters in the "Gilmore Girls" film, while Nancy's study analyzed only the Illocutionary acts and the Perlocutionary acts occur in the miscommunication between the two characters of "The Story of Us" movie.

- 2) The second study that the writer uses for this research is *Illocutionary Acts Produced by Fran Fine and Maxwell Sheffield in the Nanny* that was done by Savitri Anggraini in 2002. This study is useful, since the writer got the idea for the source of data for this research after reading Savitri's thesis. Besides that, the writer can also use some of the review of related literature that Savitri uses.

In her study, Savitri analyzed the types of Illocutionary acts used by Fran Fine and Maxwell Sheffield, and the most frequent types of

Illocution. Savitri chose this film because of its well-liked dialogues, which are very funny and cleverly written, so an utterance contains different meaning behind its literal meaning. Savitri used descriptive research for her approach, because she studies the words, phrase and sentences that are spoken by the characters.

This film tells about Fran Fine, who is a Jewish girl with a big hair, big dream and a shatter glass voice. She is the nanny for Maxwell Sheffield's children. Maxwell himself is a Broadway producer. Their status difference as the boss with glamorous life and the nanny with simple life makes their dialogues interesting to investigate.