

A SOCIOLINGUISTIC CONTEXT ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS ILLOCUTIONARY FORCES

By : Haryanto

Dosen Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan
Universitas Islam Nahdlatul Ulama Jepara

ABSTRACT

This paper is aimed at analyzing the components of situational context of "speech event", which are grouped in word 'SPEAKING' by Dell Hymes (1972). It is summed up from an acronym of the components like: Setting, Scene, Participants, Ends, Act Sequence, Key Instrumentality, Norms, and Genres. It is a Case Study among the Activist Students of in Campus.

Keywords : Speech Acts, Illocutionary Forces, locution, Illocution, Perlocution

ABSTRAK

Paper ini bertujuan untuk menganalisa komponen-komponen konteks situasi "kejadian tutur", yang terangkum dalam kata 'SPEAKING' oleh Dell Hymes (1972). Singkatan kata ini merupakan rangkuman dari komponen-komponen seperti: Latar, Layar, Peserta, Hasil, Rangkaian Tutur, Instrumen Kunci, Norma-norma, dan Jenis Tutur. Tulisan ini adalah sebuah studi kasus diantara para aktivis mahasiswa di kampus.

Kata-kata Kunci : Tindak Tutur, Dorongan Lokusi, Illokusi, Perlokusi.

INTRODUCTION

People communicate with others intensively due to the great dependency to one another in fulfilling each necessity. The media to which people communicate is language. Through language, people could convey messages to others to express his idea as well as his desire. Corder (1973:32) describes the functions of language in terms of such phrases as: “*by which man can communicate; a system of communication; for the purposes of communication*”.

The facts that people speak different languages, even different accents on the same language, has encourage people such language observers, as linguist observers, as linguist and sociologist, to expand various theories n language.

One of the well-known result of their innovation is *The Speech Act Theories*, a popular theory which has been great topic both in Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics for decades. The theory was firstly stated by Austin in 1962 and was expanded firstly by Searle in 1969.

In Speech Act Theories, language is seen as form of acting (Renkema, 1993:21). There are three kinds of action within each utterance: first, *locution*, the physical act producing an utterance; second, *illocution*, the act which is committed by producing the utterance; third, *perlocution*, the production of an effect through locution and illocution (Renkema, 1993:22). However, within the scope of Speech Act Theory, illocution has taken the highest position among the three actions. Subsequently, illocution has also becomes the prime object for any researchers who wish to dig up more about Speech Act Theory.

Schiiffrin (1995:90) stated that Speech Act Theory is basically concerned with what people ‘do’ with language – with function of language. As people usually mean something when they utter an utterance, Speech Act Theory has defined a specific term for that, named illocutionary force. It can easily be defined as communicative intentions.

Searle has made a set of devices to define the illocutionary force on utterances. Those devices are called IFIDs (*Illocutionary Forces Indicating Devices*). IFIDs includes performative verbs, word order, intonation, accent, certain

adverbs, and the mode of the verb (Renkema, 1993:26). Those elements within IFIDs are the physical characters of utterance which Schiffrin calls as “linguistic device” (1993:90)

The way illocutionary forces defined by those linguistic devices is the main reason for most language observers to give out some valuable critics for a more complete analysis to account for the coherence discourse. Therefore, some sociolinguists firmly state that a discourse must be viewed entirely, not only from single utterance.

This criticism is proposed by Michael Stubbs in ‘Discourse Analysis’: *The Sociolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language*. In his book, Stubbs tries to give a sociolinguistic analysis to language theories within both linguistic and literary fields. Speech Act Theory is one of the discussed topics. Stubbs that Speech Act must be viewed within a discourse as a whole, not as a contrived isolated sentence (1987: 156-160). In addition, a social context or the extra linguistic element within the speech act is also urgently considered.

Even though, Stubbs never disregarded the linguistic devices (IFIDs), in fact he firmly emphasized that the correct interpretation of the illocutionary force, therefore, depends on both the linguistic form of the utterance and the understanding of the social network also, for example, the authority status of the speaker (Stubbs, 1987:161). However, as language theories have been widely expanded, Stubbs tried to put a new horizon on the analysis of Speech Act Theory much in a Sociolinguistic Method.

Regarding Stubbs’ point of view, the writer intends to analyse the illocutionary force in accordance with the conversation among campus activist student, by applying Hymes’ SPEAKING model.

DISCUSSION

Stubbs has suggested that the understanding of social network is as important as the understanding of linguistic form (1987:161). It means that the

understanding of context is urgent. Schrifin outlines her point about context in sociolinguistics as being stated:

“Interactional Sociolinguistics and Ethnography of Communication also view context as ‘knowledge’, and they, too, include ‘knowledge of situation’, these approaches, however propose frame works and construct through which to analyse ‘situation’ as part of knowledge (1995:365).”

Hymes (1972) has summed up the components of situational context. He distinguishes sixteen components of ‘speech event’, which he grouped by using the word ‘SPEAKING’ s an acronym (Renkema, 1993:43). Renkema cites the ‘SPEAKING’ model from Hymes as follows :

S	Setting	Times, place, and other physical conditions surrounding the speech acts.
	Scene	The psychological counterpart to setting The participants can change what is meant here is that a setting, for example, from formal to informal
P	Participants	The speakers or senders, the addressers, the listeners, Receivers or Audience, and the Addressee
E	Ends	The purpose-outcomes, and Purpose goals
A	Act Sequence	The form and the Context of the messages
K	Key	The tone of conversation, e.g. serious or mocking
I	Instrumentality	The Channels, written telegraph, etc, and the Form of Speech; dialect, standard language, etc.
N	Norms	The norms of interaction, e.g. interruption, e.g. interruption or norm interpretation, for example how a listeners suddenly look away must be interpreted
G	Genre	Fairy tale, advertisement, etc.

The theory will be applied to analyze the illocutionary forces of the following conversations, which are labeled according to each topics:



A. Short Dialogue

- R: Mbak, The Jus nanti siang Mbak Woro lho (1)
- S: Mbak Woro? Insya Allah (,) untuk Mbak Woro aku datang deh, (2)
- makasih

The setting of this conversation took place in campus, during the spare time between the exchanges of lecture's schedule. It was an informal conversation since the situation was very relaxing and was done in standing position. The conversation was performed by two participants.

From the first utterance, it can be seen that R give a special call for S 'mbak'. It means that 'S' is 'R's senior'. With regard to the content of the first utterance (1), R seems to announce something to S. It is about the jus along with 'Mbak Woro' in it. In order to achieve a comprehensive analysis, the meaning of the special terms or each utterance must be clarified first. For example, the term 'teh jus' seems so awkward when it is combined with another term, such as 'Mbak Woro'. In fact, the jus is not a kind of drink, named juice; it is an acronym for 'Kajian Jum'at Siang', a special event for student in campus, which is aimed to give Islamic studies for those who are interested in. the speaker of that event, invited by the committee, is usually a moslem activist, which is known for her capability in Islamic Studies and Islamic movement. Regarding the fact mentioned, R personally informs S that 'Mbak Woro' will be a charming, smart, energetic, and attractive speaker, that S (2) responds R's information (1) in such an exciting expression. The utterance of R (1) is physically formed as announcement. But, respond it with such utterance '....untuk Mbak Woro aku datang deh.....; it is obvious that R is actually inviting S to come. The logic explanation is, by responding such utterance, that S is willing to attend 'the jus' as she likes 'Mbak Woro', and the opposite meaning of utterance of S would be, "sayangnya jani jibisa datang untuk pembicara yang lain". So S positively gives an assurance to the R's invitation.

Considering the language used within the conversation, it can be seen that both participants used Indonesian language in an informal speech. There is a norm

that can be found on the conversation. The term '*Insya Allah*' is used by most Moslems as an obligatory when they wish to plan something such as a promise. The writer suggests that the genre of the discourse above (between R and S), is a conversation. This choice is made by considering of coral discourse composed by Hugo Steger (1974), on the basis of sociological analysis (Renkema, 1993:92).

B. Planning a Meeting

- K: Baik (,) Rekan-rekan semua, (1)
 behubungkajian umum kita sudah selesai, saya minta rekan-
 rekan berkumpul kembali untuk membicarakan panitia RAK (.)
 Rapat Anggota Kelompok (.) Silakan kapan kira-kira waktunya
- T: Minggu depan Mas? (2)
- K: Oh nggak, minggu ini silakan dirundingkan (3)
- S: Besok aja gimana? (4)
- K: Bisa saja (.) yang lain bagaimana? (5)
- F: Sepakat (6)
- K: Jadibesok malam jam tujuh e..... (7)
- T: Eh.... Sayangggak bisa. Tapi silakan sayanggak akan datang (8)
 (Suddenly looking away to the room outside)
- K; Ya Maaf (.) karena forum (9)
 telah sepakat makarapat pembentukan panitia RAK
 dilaksanakan besok malam (.) Hari Kamis jam tujuh malam (.) ada
 yang inginditanyakan?
- F: Nggak: (10)
 (most people nod their heads)
- K: Baik (.) terimakasih atas kehadirannya (11)
 Assalamu'alaikum Warohmatullahi Wabrokatuh
- F, S, T Wa'alikumsalam Warohmatullahi Wabarokatuh (12)

Setting of the second conversation took place at the house functioned as a center of activities of organization. The activity was performed in the evening. The writer concludes that the conversation was semi-formal procedures of the meeting, which was not being conducted properly. The participants used a quite formal Indonesian language but they did not apply the norms of meeting procedure properly, such as the rule of interrupting.

There were many participants involving in the conversation. K is the forum leader, T as well as the participant, while F, with bold printed characters, was the rest forum member, consisting of more than twenty persons. The purpose of this conversation was to achieve an agreement on meeting schedule.

Utterance one (1) performed by K, might seen asking to the audience or the member of forum. However, as he said “*silakankapankira-kirawaktunya*”, he was offering a chance to the forum to define the exact schedule. T (2) suddenly replied by questioning the week of the meeting. T (2) seemed to interrupt K (1) as t (2) asked before K finished his utterance. It obviously shows that the norms of interrupting were not being applied properly. Going much further on the analysis, it does not seem hard to catch the idea of each utterance from the first to the seventh, as the dealing conversation runs smoothly. Suddenly the forum was frozen out by T (8) who was loudly announcing her objection, even before K (7) finished his words. T seemed so emotional as she spoke loudly, but then she gave a short pause before saying much further. As she was suddenly looking away to outside the room, the forum automatically felt T’s anger. The writer suggested that it as the logical reason for K (9) who was then uttering his apology to T with many short pauses. K (9) felt uncomfortable with T’s reaction (8) toward the agreement settled. Nevertheless K (9) could manage to be calm as he ended his utterance by offering a chance to the audience to ask questions. The forum replied K’s offer (9) with an agreement, signed by words “*Nggak*” (10), which meant there was no question from them and they agreed with the decision achieved, by the forum. Finally K (11) closed the meeting with a loud greeting ‘*salam*’, which is immediately answered by the forum in a loud voice also.

The language used in this conversation mostly was in Indonesian standard. Though the forum tended to neglect the formal norms of meeting, such as norm of interrupting, however, they were aware of other norms, such as norms of interruption, which was being applied to interrupt T's reaction (8) toward the agreement. There is another norm, which is needed to be viewed. It is the norm of ending a forum with a greeting. This ritual is usually done by Moslems.

The writer assumes that the genre of this discourse was a conversation. This decision is made by applying Steger's classification of oral discourse (1974) that is cited by Renkema.

CONCLUSION

The writer agrees with the idea proposed by Stubbs, that understanding both linguistic form of the utterance and the 'extra linguistic factors' or the social Hymes' SPEAKING rule within the discourse or the utterance, are critically needed. Therefore, it is very important to reckon the gestures as well as the style of the illocutionary forces.

Nevertheless, it is possible to dug up more about illocutionary forces of speech acts much in a Sociolinguistic way, since the society controls our speech acts in two ways (Hudson, 1996). The ways are by providing a set of norms, and the society's motivation walks on those norms.



BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Corder, S. Pit. 1973. *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Great Britain: Hazel Watson & Viney, Ltd.

Hudson, A.A. 1996. *Sociolinguistics*, 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Renkema, Jan. 1993. *Discourse Studies*. An Introduction TextBook. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Schiffin, Deborah. 1995. *Approaches to Discourse*. UK: Blackwell

Stubbs, Michel. 1987. "Discourse Analysis". *The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Great Britain: Basil Blackwell Ltd.