

AN ANALYSIS OF ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS AS
FOUND IN FORBIDDEN EXPRESSIONS OF PUBLIC
PLACES

A THESIS

Submitted in a Partial to the Requirement for the Degree of Sarjana



By:

Lusiana Ismawati Rahayu

05 185 009

FACULTY OF LETTER
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

ANDALAS UNIVERSITY

2009



ABSTRAK

Skripsi ini berjudul *An Analysis of Illocutionary Act as Found in Forbidden Expression of Public Places* atau *Sebuah Analisis Tindak Tutur yang Ditemukan dalam Ungkapan Larangan pada Tempat-Tempat Umum*. Ungkapan larangan tersebut terdapat dalam ungkapan yang mengandung tindakan-tindakan yang berbahaya dan merugikan diri sendiri serta orang lain. Data yang digunakan sebagai bahan analisis diambil dari internet.

Dalam pembahasan skripsi ini, penulis menganalisis data dengan menggunakan metode padan pragmatik serta metode distribusi. Ungkapan tersebut kemudian dianalisis dengan menggunakan teori yang dikemukakan oleh John L. Austin dalam bukunya *How to Do Things With Words* yang dipublikasikan pada tahun 1962 untuk mengkaji pembagian tindak tutur secara implisit dan eksplisit, dan teori yang dikemukakan oleh John. R. Searle yang terdapat dalam bukunya berjudul *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* pada tahun 1969 untuk membagi tipe-tipe tindak tutur secara langsung dan tidak langsung serta literal dan non literal, juga teori untuk menentukan fungsi tindak tutur.

Dari penelitian ini, hasil yang ditemukan menunjukkan bahwa sembilan puluh persen (90%) dari ungkapan tindak tutur dalam ungkapan larangan muncul pada ungkapan langsung dan literal secara eksplisit, dan hanya sepuluh persen (10%) yang muncul pada ungkapan tidak langsung dan literal secara implisit. Selain daripada itu, tindak tutur dalam ungkapan larangan mempunyai lebih dari satu fungsi, namun demikian ungkapan tersebut tetap difungsikan untuk membuat ungkapan larangan.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Nowadays, people need language more than just to deliver an idea, opinion, argument, feeling, and information. In fact, language in its broader sense is used to make a rule in order to control human life. The rules need to be realized, obeyed, and applied by the people. The rules which are made are such as *forbidden expressions*. The *forbidden expression* is used to keep the cleanliness, peacefulness, embellishment more important security, such as found in public places. The rule is a constituent that must be obeyed by every person, and for those who violate the rules, they will get serious trouble or to be punished related to the rule as its consequences.

In addition, *Forbidden expression* is applied as rule that is created by using language. It cannot be denied that language has an important role in making *forbidden expression*. It is because when people use and apply their language, they reveal in promising, commanding, requesting, ordering, apologizing, informing, greeting, and even in warning.

Austin concludes that the empirical evidence compels that there are many utterances which can not ascribe any truth value at all. For example, when we promise it can not be categorized as a statement of truth or false value at all. In natural conversation, sometimes speaker utters certain utterances without explicit saying "I promise" and it is not too difficult for the listener to figure out whether the speaker promised to do something or not. But, Austin introduces the idea that to say something is to do something, as in promise;

there is an act to do something in utterance. In other words, there are many acts related to the verb which called "the performative verb". The performative verb can be deployed in performative utterance as its function, which views in class of implicit and explicit performative utterance (Levinson, 1983:229).

Austin in the "Performative Utterance" introduces the idea that to say something is to do something and he also explains in "How to Do Things with Words" There are various kinds of acts connected with speaking: locution, illocution and perlocution (Searle, 1969:119). Leech (1996:48-49) defines "locutionary act is the basic of utterance which produce a meaningful linguistic expression, while illocutionary act is defined as performed via the communicative force of an utterance, and perlocutionary acts as an utterance with a function without intending it to have an effect".

The *forbidden* expression is a way that the authorized people create rules. It is a kind of announcement and it is used not only to deliver meaning, but also differences, because *forbidden expression* is used to inform people to obey the rules. Besides, it is used to command or order people to do, it is also to forbid them to break the rules. Here are examples of *forbidden expression*:

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

4.1 Conclusion

Having analyzed the data on the previous chapter, as the result of the analysis, the writer comes to the finding of the research of illocutionary acts of warning as found in forbidden expressions in public places. There are some aspects which are concerned by the writer in finding the data, firstly the types of illocutionary act, and secondly the function of illocutionary act found in forbidden expression.

In addition, the writer finds the occurrence or existence of types of illocutionary acts of forbidden expression through the classification of explicit and implicit expression as proposed by Austin resulting in finding that explicit warning expression is more dominant than implicit warning expression. The writer finds 10% illocutionary acts exists implicitly and 90% illocutionary acts exists explicitly from ten data that have been analyzed by the writer. The classification into the types of illocutionary acts based on proposed by Searle's theory also similar that shows 10% are occurred in literal indirect illocutionary act and the rest about 90% are occurred in literal direct illocutionary act in forbidden expression from the data that have been analyzed. It is caused by the fact that the forbidden expression is regulated to make people recognize the rule clearly in literal meaning, without any misunderstandings in applying the rule as found in forbidden expressions in public places.

Briefly, the finding can be concluded that:

- 1) Illocutionary act as found in forbidden expression can be intended or applied in explicit illocutionary act if it occurs in and uses the performative verb such as "warn or prohibited" in the expression to convey it. And also the interpretation of the expression is perfectly clear from the context.
- 2) Illocutionary Act as found in forbidden expression can be intended or applied in implicit illocutionary act if it does not convey the performative verb in the expression to convey it. In the line with this, the context of situation described is intended as warning or prohibition.
- 3) The forbidden expression conveyed directive illocutionary acts to order and command to make a warning or prohibition people as its function, but it also can be existed in the form of expressive of illocutionary act of thanking used to make order or command.
- 4) Illocutionary Act as found in forbidden expression can be conveyed in literal direct and literal indirect to make people understand, regard and apply the rule depending on the condition of the place.
- 5) Forbidden expression is not always apply the performative verb "warn or prohibited" because it is already conveyed and understood as command and order to people as long as the