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Abstract

‘English Tivi’ channel is a learning medium on Youtube which provides materials for learning English through stories. This paper is aimed to analyze the use of illocutionary acts in the stories presented. Three different stories are chosen as the subject of this study, namely: A Police TV, The Dangerous Journey, and Rich man Poor man. The data of this paper are all the utterances conveyed by the characters in the stories that are assumed employing the principles of illocutionary acts. The data were taken by observing the whole stories and transcribing all the utterances produced which have characteristics of illocutionary acts. The data are analyzed and classified based on the functions of illocutionary acts. The functions are inferred based on the five kinds of illocutionary acts proposed by Searle (1969), namely: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives. This paper is expected to be beneficial for Teacher Language Awareness (TLA): how the principles of Pragmatics used in language learning process, in case of constructing and deconstructing text (spoken or written) by language learners for communicating in real life contexts.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Speech Acts, Illocutionary Acts, Language Learning, English Stories

Introduction

‘English Tivi’ channel is one of interesting channels on Youtube for learning English. This channel provides language learning materials through stories. Kinds of stories are presented related to the ordinary activities around us. The stories contain conversations talking about real life contexts. So, those are considered providing various kinds of speech acts phenomena.

Pragmatics principles are considered as another important aspect of language learning process. It is stated by Bardovi-Harlig and Griffin (2005) that Pragmatics is one of major fields of language study in linguistics, and now it is seen very beneficial in language teaching and learning process. Pragmatics competence has come to be viewed as an essential part of learners’ competence. In this case, speech acts as a part of pragmatics principles are counted as beneficial understanding for teaching language in foreign or second language learning.

As a research done by Alemi and Irandoost (2012), in their study about the evaluation of speech acts in a text book which focused on the analyzing and evaluating the appearance of compliment and complaint acts, they offered that it is viewed very beneficial to give more original and helpful instructions of speech acts for a course book, to improve the learners’ performance in real life communication. It can be argued that the exploration of speech acts in text books or
language learning materials is considered to be necessary.

Another research done by Kohandani et al. (2014) in which this study analyzed the conversations presented in a text book. This study focused on the pragmatic perspectives of language functions and speech acts. This study found that the conversations presented in this textbook do not properly function as pragmatics perspectives. As the result, the deficiencies of the conversations presented are proposed to be compensated by the teachers and material developers regarding to the pragmatics principles especially language functions and speech acts. It is concluded that teaching language is not only teaching about the language but also the pragmatics principles, in which language should be taught to be used appropriately in different context.

The aim of this paper is to explore the illocutionary acts phenomena presented in the three chosen stories taken from this medium of learning English. The kinds of illocutionary acts as proposed by Searle (1969) are revealed. The factors are identified. The functions are classified based on the context espousing the utterances.

This paper is expected to be beneficial for Teacher Language Awareness (TLA) in relating to the understanding of the principles of Pragmatics to be incorporated in language learning process in which teachers should teach the language, not about the language. This study also offer the pedagogical implication of language learning, in case of constructing and deconstructing text (spoken or written) by language learners for using language in real life communication.

Speech Acts and pragmatics

Speech acts are a branch of pragmatic studies. They are language phenomena appearing surrounding society. They are found in memes as social network sites phenomena (Grundlingh, 2017). They are presented in written advertisement (Simon and Dejica-Cartis, 2015). And, they are also evaluated and analyzed in textbooks for language learning (Alemi and Irandoost, 2012; Kohandani et al., 2014).

As described by Yule (2010, 133), pragmatics is the study focusing on “what speakers mean”. The communication is emphasized on “besides recognizing the meaning of words in a utterance, the interlocutors must also recognize what speakers mean by their utterances”. When people are communicating with a text (oral or written), interpreting the meaning is considered by knowing the word or the utterances conveyed to deliver the message and relying on what we think about the speakers’ intention in communicating the message. Those are how speech acts understood.

As suggested by Austin (1962), when people are conveying utterances, they are not only saying something, but they intend to do something, for instance, promising, apologizing, commanding, and so on. Austin defined speech acts into three forms: first, locutionary acts which are the presentation of the sounds and words. Second, illocutionary acts which are the act of saying something. Third, perlocutionary acts which are the effect of saying something (intentionally or unintentionally).

Five kinds of illocutionary acts are proposed by Searle (1969). First, assertives, which are statements or delivering facts, emphasizing the interlocutors to form or attend a belief, for examples; stating, boasting, complaining, and so on. Second, directives, in which the speakers intend for getting the interlocutors to do something, for examples; ordering, commanding, requesting, and so on. Second, expressive, in which the speakers intend for getting the interlocutors to do something, for examples; ordering, commanding, requesting, and so on. Third, expressive, in which the speakers convey their feeling toward the interlocutors, for examples; thanking, congratulating,
pardoning, agreeing, greeting and so on (Ronan, 2015). Fourth, commissives, in which the speakers give commitment to do something regarding to the interlocutor, for examples; promising, rowing, offering, and so on. Fifth, declaratives, in which the speakers determine what the case is in an institution or change an institutional state of affairs regarding to the interlocutors, for examples; resigning, dismissing, naming, sentencing, and so on (Grundlingh, 2017).

Method
Source of Data
The data of this paper are taken in “English Tivi” channel on Youtube which presents materials for learning English through stories. Three stories are chosen, namely: A Police TV by Tim Vicary, The Dangerous Journey by Alwyn Cox, and Rich man Poor man by T. C. Jupp. Each story contains ordinary conversation related to daily activities and actions conveyed by the characters in the stories.

Data Collection and Data Analysis
In collecting the data, the researcher used Simak method. It is done by watching the stories on Youtube carefully and are proceeded by transcribing the data. The utterances conveyed in each stories are the main data that are identified, classified, and analyzed (Sudaryanto, 2015:203).

The researcher used Padan method to analyze the data (Sudaryanto, 2015:15). It is done by identifying the utterances conveyed in each story; regarding to the kinds of illocutionary acts proposed by Searle. Then, the utterances that have been chosen are classified based on the functions. The functions are categorized based on the context of the utterances by using pragmatics analysis. In the last step, the data are analyzed by offering the factors espousing each kind of illocutionary acts.

Finding and Discussion
Searle defined four kinds of illocutionary acts as communicative categories, i.e; assertives, directives, expressives, and commissives. Whereas, declaratives are considered as not communicative acts (voting, resigning, marrying, christening, and so on). To determine the result, the four main communicative categories of illocutionary acts are proposed in which the functions are classified based on these four main communicative categories as found on the utterances presented in the stories. The factors are established based on the functions founded to determine the function classifications. The result is described as follows:

Communicative Illocutionary Acts

- **Assertives**
  - Informing
  - Predicting
  - Confirming
  - Complaining
  - Disputing
  - Boasting
  - Claiming

- **Directives**
  - Commanding
  - Questioning
  - Recommending
  - Suggesting
  - Prohibiting
  - Requiring
  - Requesting

- **Commissive**
  - Offering
  - Promising

- **Expressives**
  - Pardoning
  - Rejecting
  - Thanking
  - Admitting
  - Blaming
  - Agreeing
Figure 1. Classification of the functions of illocutionary acts performed in the stories presented based on the four communicative categories.

Based on the classification of the functions above, the result of analyzing the number of utterances appearing in the stories taken as the data of this study is described in the table as follows:

Table 1. Number of utterances appearing in the stories presented based on the functions of the four communicative illocutionary acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number of Utterances Appearing in the Stories</th>
<th>Total Number of Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Story I</td>
<td>Story II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boasting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiming</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggesting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibiting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardoning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Story I: A Police TV by Tim Vicary
Story II: The Dangerous Journey by Alwyn Cox
Story III: Rich man and Poor man by T. C. Jupp

After exploring the data as drawn above, the result shows that every story consists of various kinds of illocutionary acts which it is showed from the classification of the functions of each kind of act and story. Classifying the functions based on the four communicative categories of illocutionary acts reveals that: first, assertive acts in story I consist of three functions (informing, predicting, and confirming); story II consists of five functions (informing, predicting, claiming, disputing, and boasting); story III consists of four functions (informing, predicting, boasting, and claiming). Each function is showed by a number of utterances.

Second, directive acts disclose that: story I and II consist of five functions (commanding, questioning, recommending, suggesting, and prohibiting); story III consists of six functions (recommending, commanding, requiring, prohibiting, requesting, and questioning). A number of utterances are found in each function of these acts.

Third, commissive acts reveal that: story I, II, and III consist of two functions, namely: promising and offering. These two functions are presented in a number of utterances.

Fourth, expressive acts show that: story I consists of four functions (pardoning,
rejecting, thanking, and admitting); story II consists of three functions (blaming, thanking, and admitting); story III consists of four functions (blaming, admitting, thanking, and pardoning). These functions are performed mostly with one utterance for each function.

The result also shows that the richest story of presenting functions based on the four communicative categories of illocutionary acts is story III; it presents 17 functions, 54 utterances are found as performing these all functions. Whereas, story II presents 16 functions, it is performed by 60 utterances. As the last, story I presents 14 functions performed by 52 utterances.

**Conclusions**

This paper classified the all the utterances presented in the three chosen stories based on the functions in which these functions are classified based on the four communicative categories of illocutionary acts proposed by Searle. By exploring these three stories, this paper reveals that various kinds of functions of illocutionary acts are found. It can be argued that these stories are pragmatically rich to be used for language leaning material regarding to improve learners’ pragmatic competence, particularly the use of speech acts for communicating in real life context.

Another aspect of this paper is that pedagogical implication is offered to the learners and teachers. Pragmatics analysis gives widely an understanding of pedagogical implication related to language learning process, in case of constructing and deconstructing texts (written or spoken). The understanding of these aspects of learning is a part of pragmatic principles. So, those are considered that pragmatic principles are very beneficial for second or foreign language learners and teachers.
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