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ABSTRACT


This research focuses on the kinds of illocutionary act based on by John. R. Searle’s theory in the Reasonable Doubt movie directed by Peter Howitt and written by Peter A Dowling released on January 17, 2014 in the USA. The movie script used to gather the data is written by www.springfieldspringfield.co.uk. This research tries to reveal whether the expected perlocutionary act will be fulfilled by the hearers involved in the conversation in this movie. The aim of this research is to find out the classification of Illocutionary acts performed by the speakers in the movie dialogues and to evaluate whether the hearers will respond to the same way the speaker is expecting, in other words, fulfilling the perlocutionary act of the speech act. The methodology used in this research is a qualitative method. The data are collected by watching the movie and reading all of the dialogues. After that, the writer classifies the speech acts found in the dialogues based on Searle’s theoretical framework. After classifying the types of illocutionary acts, the writer points out the most frequently used type of illocutionary act and the reason behind it. Then, the writer describes whether the perlocutionary act expected by the speaker really occurs in each conversation. The result of this study shows that all types of illocutionary acts are found in this movie, with representative as the most frequently used type of illocutionary act. Furthermore, most of the perlocutionary acts expected by the speakers in this movie are fulfilled by the hearers, except in some cases where specific contextual factors do not allow the speakers to do what the speakers want.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Research

Language is a sound symbol system which is agreed to use by certain group of society in cooperative, communication and self-identity (Kridalaksana et al. 3). People use language for their conversation everyday such as transaction, business, planning meals and vacations, debating politics and gossiping (Clark 3). In daily life, language is also used to express human feelings. Through language, people can send their purpose to their listeners. Besides, Language according to Soenjono Djarjowidjojo is a kind of an oral arbitrary symbol used by several people to communicate and interact each other, adjusting to a particular culture (Djarjowidjojo 16). In communication, human convey the information each other, such as thought, concept, purpose, feeling and also conveying emotions directly, in this communication process, speech event and speech act are happened together in one of act situation (Chaer 47). Speech act and speech event are two symptoms which connected in one process that is communication process (Chaer 50).

Theory of speech act was originally by J.L Austin, a philosopher at Harvard University in 1956. The theory was arranged by J.O. Urmson on 1965 by the title How to do things with words, but that theory was developed completely after Searle has published the book Speech Acts: An Essay in the philosophy of language (Searle 33).
According to Searle, in all linguistics communications has a speech act. He proposes that communication is not just enough to a symbol, word or sentence but also the result from the fire of performance of speech acts (Searle 33). Thus, it can be said that the speech act is the basic unit of communication. Speech act is a basic analysis in pragmatics study. According to Austin, speech act is not used just to say things, describe the state of affairs but rather actively to do things (Austin 12). In which say something is to do something, or in which by saying or saying something people doing something.

According to the explanations above, it can be concluded that speech act is an act of saying something which has certain purpose and can be expressed explicitly or implicitly. In speech act theory, language is seen as a form of acting, by studying how people perform speech acts such as apologizing, promising, ordering, offering, etc. As Austin says, he isolates three basic senses in which in saying something one are doing something, and hence three kinds of acts that are simultaneously performed: locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Among those all, illocutionary act is absolutely essential to any discussion of speech acts, and considers the illocutionary acts as the speech acts itself. It describes what the speaker (S) does in uttering (U) to the hearer (H) in the context (C) (Austin 236).

Speech act’s theory of Austin is speech acts which focus on speakers, In contrast to Austin, who focuses his attention on how speakers realize their intentions in speaking, Searle focuses on how listeners respond to utterances, that is, how one person tries to figure out how another is using a particular utterance
(Wardhaugh 279). So Searle tries to find the value of illocutionary understood by listeners.

In this research, the writer aims to investigate a movie by title *Reasonable Doubt*, directed by Peter Howitt and written by Peter A Dowling released on January 17, 2014 at USA. This movie tells about a district attorney Mitch Brockden, (Dominic Cooper) who is involved in a fatal hit-and-run in the road, but Clinton Davis who is found with the body and charge with murder.

In *Reasonable Doubt* movie contains many illocutionary acts, the illocutionary act is analyzed based on context; it is about what’s going on behind the text. Context is the background knowledge assumed to be shared by *s* (speaker) and *h* (hearer) and which contributes to hearer’s interpretation of what speaker means by given utterance (Leech 13). For example ‘Shut the door!’ based on the example, it means people want somebody to close the door, on the other hand, it is called an order statement which the speaker intends to order people for the self-importance. There are some categories of illocutionary act which has been stated by Searle; Representative, Directives, Commissives, Expressives, and Declaratives (Searle 12-20) after the illocutionary act is uttered by the speaker there will be the result of the words this act is known as “perlocutionary effect” it is the effect on the hearer, hearer’s reaction (Cutting 16). The effect can be occurred based on the hearer’s power, the hearer may follow or not the illocutionary act from the speaker.

There are many illocutionary acts which uttered by every character in the *Reasonable Doubt* movie. For example of illocutionary act in main character
Mitch Brockden, when he will separated with his friends in the street, one of his friends Stuart says to him “Listen, when you throw up in the middle of the night, aim away from your baby”, In that sentence shows that Stuart suggested to him in order to Mitch keep away from his baby. Stuart does directive illocutionary act and one of directive illocutionary is commanding. Stuart conveys his wish for the addressee to do something. His utterance is aimed at making Mitch do something. It means Mitch must be careful to keep his baby from the bad thing which can endanger her.

The writer is interested in analyzing the perlocutionary effect of illocutionary act toward the hearers which contains in the movie scripts, because illocutionary act is the important part in understanding speech act and it has a significant effect in communication which is the act of doing something, and also in order to know hearer’s response well about what speaker is saying or usually called perlocutionary act. The writer will analyze illocutionary act which is find in this study as the main focus in this research, such as representative, directive, expressive, declarative and commissive.

B. Focus of the Research

The writer will analyze the speech act which uttered by the characters in the Reasonable Doubt movie. The research focuses on the text of the script’s movie by a pragmatic approach, which contains illocutionary acts by John. R. Searle, as a part of speech act in several characters and several scenes. This research will also focus on the perlocutionary effect of hearers in the Reasonable Doubt movie, directed by Peter Howitt and written by Peter A Dowling.
C. Research Questions

The writer has two questions for the study, namely:

1. What types of illocutionary act uttered by the characters in the movie *Reasonable Doubt*?

2. How does the perlocutionary act expected by the speaker to the hearer’s responses in the movie *Reasonable Doubt*?

D. Significance of the Research

By analyzing the theory of speech acts in *Reasonable Doubt* movie, the writer expects that through this study:

The readers are able to understand deeply about the topics of pragmatics especially speech act, the readers has better understanding about illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act, know clearly about the hearer’s response to illocutionary act from that movie, the readers can also apply their knowledge in using speech act correctly. By recognizing the speech acts, the learners hopefully will get some important information occurring in this world accurately especially in English Language films. This study is expected to be an additional contribution to what has been done by other people in the field of speech act. Particularly, it can enrich the research of linguistic fields in this university, especially the English Language and Letters Department, Faculty of Adab and Humanities.

E. Research Methodology

1. Objectives of the Research
   a. Analyzing the types of illocutionary act uttered by the characters in the movie *Reasonable Doubt*. 
b. Analyzing the effects of perlocutionary act expected by the speaker to the hearer’s response in the movie *Reasonable Doubt*.

### 2. Method of the Research

In this research, the writer uses illocutionary act data in the movie scripts of *Reasonable Doubt* so the writer uses the qualitative method. In this method, the data are analyzed qualitative. This method uses methods or relevant approach such as historical approach, sociological, psychological, and textual approach (Farkhan 33-34). While qualitative study is the research by using word, scheme, and picture (Sugiyono 11) and very suitable applied in this linguistic research.

### 3. Technique of Data Collecting and Data Analysis

In this research, the writer uses descriptive analysis technique. Then, there are the steps of data collection as follows:

a. The whole script as a source of data is read thoroughly.

b. The data which contains illocutionary act are given a mark.

c. Identifying every conversation from several characters and scenes in the movie which contains illocutionary act.

d. The writer uses the appropriated theory to classify and to analyze this study. The writer also analyzes the effect of the hearer’s response.

e. Last, the writer concludes the results.
4. **Instrument of the Research**

The research uses a data card as the instrument of the research. This instrument is used to classify the speech act happened in the movie *Reasonable Doubt*. The relevant data is written in a data card and the main problem which is the target of the research will be written on the card as the head (entry) (Subroto43). Thus this instrument makes the researcher easy to classify the data.

5. **Unit of Analysis**

This research uses the illocutionary act in the script of *Reasonable Doubt* movie directed by Peter Howitt and written by Peter A Dowling released on January 17, 2014, at USA.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Research

There are many researchers who worked in speech act research especially in analyzing the speech act. In order to avoid the similar corpus and explanations, there should be a review of previous research. The following is the other related research that the researcher has read.

First is the research was done by Ijadimine Olamide and Aminu Segun entitle *A Speech Act Analysis of Editorial Comments of TELL Magazine*. This Journal is published by *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* in Department of Languages, Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Ondo State, Nigeria, which were published on January and February 2014. Vol. 4 No. 9. The aim of this research is to understand an argument based on Searle’s Speech acts as used by Mey (2006) in the Editorial Comments of TELL Magazine in Nigeria, the next aim is to identify and analyze speech act in the selected editorial comments then to influence the readers about news items through the perlocutionary effects and illocutionary acts. The results of this research can be concluded as follows:

1. The tables of analysis describe that representatives and expressive have the highest percentage with forty point six percent each.

2. Twenty point five percent of the illocutionary acts in the analysis is declarative. The researchers use declarative acts to support the decision and introduce verdict.
3. The commissive act is only six point three percent. The writers use little on commissive illocutionary acts that function to raise the hope of readers on their ability and decision in the future.

Second, the research, which is published by *The International Journal of Social Science* on January 30, 2014, Vol.19 No.1 in English Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, University of Padjadjaran Bandung Indonesia, was done by Iman Santoso, Eva Tuckyta Sari Sujatna and Sutiono Mahdi. The title of this research is *Speech Act on Short Stories; A Pragmatic Study*. The study collected the data from a teen magazine *Creative and Smart* with different volumes. The aim of this research is to find out appropriate classification pragmatic communicative functions which there in the short stories for teens. The method which is used in this research is qualitative method. The result of this research is classification system list five types of speech acts they are declarations, representatives, expressive, directives, commissives. More likely to be used are directive, expressive, commissives when they are making short stories. They were usually being delivered in formal situations with long sentence structures in speech acts.

Third, the research has been done by Fifin Dwi Isnawati, Syamsul Anam, and Sabta Diana, Faculty of Literature, University of Jember in Jl. Kalimantan 37, Jember 68121. The title of this research is *Speech Acts Analysis of the Main Character in Shrek Movie Script*. This research is published by *Publika Budaya* on March 3, 2015. The aims of this research are to describe the types of speech acts which are produced by the main characters in *Shrek* movie script, to explain and analyze the most dominant speech acts and to know the purposes of
Shrek as the main character when using speech acts. Moreover, the method of this research is qualitative and quantitative method. The result of this research shows that the four types of speech acts produced by Shrek are directives, representatives, expressives, and commissives. This study shows that the most dominant speech acts used is directives, it reaches forty-four percent, and it also indicates that Shrek uses directives because he wants to make the hearer do something.

Fourth, the research has been done by Riska Rahman entitle An Analysis of Illocutionary and Perlocutionary act in Detective Conan Comic, the research is published in State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, October 21, 2015. The aim of this research are to find out the classification of Illocutionary acts used in comic Detective Conan and how the hearer gives the perlocutionary effect to the speaker, the method which is used in this research is the qualitative to analyze the data. While the results of this research are the researcher found all the classification of illocutionary act they are: Declarations, Representatives, Expressives, Directives, and Commissives. Furthermore, the researcher found various ways the perlocutionary effects successful or unsuccessful after the speech act are uttered.

B. Speech Acts

One of the discussions of pragmatics is speech act. Speech act begins from lectures delivered by the Britain Philosopher, John. L. Austin, at Harvard University in 1955 (Nadar 11). Yule states that actions performed via utterances are generally called speech acts. If you work in a situation where a boss has a
great deal of power, the boss’s utterance of the expression “you’re fired” is more than just a statement, that utterance can be used to perform the act of ending your employment. Another example are commonly given more specific labels, such as apology, complain, compliment, invitation, promise or request (Yule 47).

In speech act theory, language is seen as a form of acting, by studying how people perform speech acts such as apologizing, promising, ordering, etc. In *How to Do Things with Words*, Austin used the terms constantives and performatives to describe the difference of utterances. In constantives, such as a sentence, (a) ‘It’s raining’ something is stated about reality. In performatives, such as a sentence, (b) ‘I promise that I will give you one hundred dollars tomorrow’ it is an act that performed by utterances itself (Renkema 14). Constantive utterances describe or report events and states of affairs in the word. As such, they can be said to be true or false. However, performative utterances do not describe or report or constant anything at all are not true or false and the uttering of the sentence is or is part of, doing an action, which again would not normally be described as, or as just saying something (Coming 6).

According to Austin, speech act is not used just to say things, describe the state of affairs but rather actively to do things (Austin 12). For example:

a. “*I now pronounce you husband and wife*” as uttered in the course of marriage ceremony

b. “*I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth*” as uttered when smashing the bottle against the stem.

c. “*I give and bequeath my watch to my brother*” as occurring in a will.
In those examples, it seems clear that to utter the sentence in, of course, the appropriate circumstances do not describe his doing of what he should be said in so uttering to be doing state that he is doing it (Austin 12).

Another definition is defined by Searle that speech acts as the unit of linguistic communication are not, as has generally been supposed, the symbol, word or sentence. However, rather the production of the symbol or word or sentence in the performance of the speech acts (Mey 95). People do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words, but they perform actions via those utterances, such as promising, referring, predicating, questioning, commanding, thanking, congratulating, explaining et.cetera (Nadar 14).

A speech act changes in some way the conditions that exist in the world. It does something, and it is not something that in itself is either true or false. Truth and falsity may be claims made about its having been done, but they cannot be made about the actual doing. Austin pointed out that the ‘circumstances’ mentioned above can be prescribed. He mentions certain Felicity Conditions that performatives must meet to be successful.

First, a conventional procedure must exist for doing whatever is to be done, and that procedure must specify who must say and do what and in what circumstances. Second, all participants must properly execute this procedure and carry it through to completion. Finally, the necessary thoughts, feelings, and intentions must be present in all parties. In general, the spoken part of the total act, the actual speech act, will take the grammatical form of having a first person subject and a verb in
the present tense; it may or may not also include the word hereby. Examples are ‘I (hereby) name,’ ‘We decree,’ and ‘I swear.’ This kind of utterance is explicitly performative when it is employed in a conventional framework, such as naming ships, making royal proclamations, and taking an oath in court (Wardhaugh 275-276).

Austin also acknowledges that there are also less Explicit Performatives. Declarations like ‘I promise,’ ‘I apologize,’ or ‘I warn you’ have many of the same characteristics as the previously mentioned utterances but lack any associated conventional procedure; for anyone can promise, apologize, and warn.

Austin realized that often the Implicit Performatives, ones without the performative verbs, as in the original version of this dialogue, sound more natural. Take the expression “I’ll be back!” It can mean either ‘I promise that I will be back’ or ‘I warn you that I’ll be back.’ (Cutting 16)

The utterance above is used to perform as a promise which is uttered by I to promise that I will be back. Based on examples above, clearly that every utterance has a meaning to do something, then actions performed via utterances are generally called speech act.

Searle has concentrated his work on speech acts on how a hearer perceives a particular utterance to have the force it has, what he calls the ‘uptake’ of an utterance. In particular, what makes a promise a promise? For Searle, there are five rules that govern promise-making. The first, the propositional content rule, is that the words must predicate a future action of the speaker. The second and third, the preparatory rules, require that both the person promising and the
person to whom the promise is made must want the act done and that it would not otherwise be done. Moreover, the person promising believes he or she can do what is promised. The fourth, the *sincerity rule*, requires the promiser to intend to perform the act, that is, to be placed under some kind of obligation; and the fifth, the *essential rule*, says that the uttering of the words counts as undertaking an obligation to perform the action. For example, a command such as ‘Stand up!’ from A to B can be felicitous only if B is not standing up, can stand up, and has an obligation to stand up if A so requests, and if A has a valid reason to make B stand up. Both A and B must recognize the validity of all these conditions if ‘Stand up!’ is to be used and interpreted as a proper command (Wardhaugh 278).

C. Types of Speech Acts

According to Searle (1969, pp. 23–4), we perform different kinds of acts when we speak. The utterances we use are *locutions*. Most locutions express some intent that a speaker has. They are *illocutionary acts* and have an *illocutionary force*. A speaker can also use different locutions to achieve the same illocutionary force or use one locution for many different purposes. Illocutions also often cause listeners to do things. To that extent they are *perlocutionary acts*. (Wardhaugh 277)

* Austin made a three-fold distinction:

Locution: the actual words uttered.

Illocution: the force or intention behind the words.

Perlocution: the effect of the illocution on the hearer.
For example, I might say: *It's hot in here!* (Locution), meaning: *I want some fresh air!* (Illocution) and the Perlocutionary effect might be that someone opens the window. (Thomas 49)

Austin states that there are three kinds of the different act; Locutionary act, Illocutionary act, and Perlocutionary act (Austin 236).

1. **Locutionary Act**

   Locutionary act is called as the act of saying something (Riemer 109). This is the basic act of utterance or producing a meaningful linguistic expression (Yule 48). In other words, the production of sounds and words with meaning, for instance, an utterance such as: *‘I just resigned’*. However the utterance purely descriptive statement, which does not change the universe employment of mine, only reports on such a change (Mey 122).

   It refers to the fact that we must use words or sentences if we are to say anything at all (Wardhaugh 277). For example, when someone said “you can’t do that,” it’s a simple act that is performed in saying something, in this case the saying of speaker. The locution was the utterances itself “you can’t do that” (Levinson 237).

2. **Illocutionary Act**

   According to Wijana, illocutionary act is called ‘the act of doing something’ (Wijana 18) we form an utterance with some kind of function in mind. This is the second dimension or the illocutionary act. The illocutionary act is performed via the communicative force of an utterance (Yule 48). Illocutionary acts have to do with the intents of speakers such as starting, questioning,
promising or commanding (Wardhaugh 277). The illocutionary act is analyzed based on context; it is about what’s going on behind the text. Context is the background knowledge assumed to be shared by s (speaker) and h (hearer) and which contributes to hearer’s interpretation of what speaker means by given utterance (Leech 13).

For example, *it feels hot, isn’t it?* To find the illocutionary aspect in this sentence, it ought to relate to the context when this utterance occurs. Another example *‘Shut the door!’* based on the example, it means people want somebody to close the door, on the other hand, it is called an order statement which the speaker intends to order people for the self-importance. The illocutionary act relates to the speaker’s purpose. In other words, every speaker has certain purposes by uttering utterances.

The purpose of illocutionary act is to produce the utterance known as illocutionary force. By using illocutionary force, the speaker informs something in conversation or communication. Then that information will be received by the hearer. The illocutionary act succeeds to achieve the perlocutionary effect. Actually, illocutionary act is rather difficult to be identified than locutionary act because we have to consider who will be the speaker and the hearer are, when and where the speech acts occur. Thus, the illocutionary act is central of understanding speech act (Wijana 19).
3. **Perlocutionary Act**

Perlocutionary act is the act of producing an effect in the hearer by means of the utterance (Riemer 109). In perlocutionary, there is an influence affect. The speaker tries to influence the hearer to do what he/she wants to do. Perlocutionary act is the hearer’s reaction toward the speaker’s utterance. Thus, an utterance can cause the hearer to do something. In addition, perlocutionary act is an act to influence the hearer such as, embarrassing, intimidating, and persuading and so on (Nadar 15). Perlocutionary act is the effect created by illocutionary act to the hearer, such as shocking, misleading, and convincing and so on. This act is also known as, ‘the act of affecting someone’ (Wijana 20).

Illocutions also often cause listeners to do things. To that extent they are *perlocutionary acts*. If you say ‘*I bet you a dollar he’ll win*’ and I say ‘*On,*’ your illocutionary act of offering a bet has led to my perlocutionary uptake of accepting it. The *perlocutionary force* of your words is to get me to bet, and you have succeeded (Wardhaugh 277).

The contrasts between illocutions, perlocutions, and other speech act categories have typically been illustrated by lists of verbs and verb like expressions. For example:

**Illocutionary:** report, announce, predict, admit, opine, ask, reprimand, request, suggest, order, propose, express, congratulate, promise, thank, exhort.

**Perlocutionary:** bring hearer to learn that, persuade, deceive, encourage, irritate, frighten, amuse, get hearer to do, inspire, impress, distract, get hearer to think about, relieve tension, embarrass, attract attention, bore (Leech 203).
D. Classification of Illocutionary Acts

The classification used in the analysis is Searle’s theory, the writer chooses Searle’s classification over Austin’s because Searle thinks Austin’s taxonomy of illocutionary act contains several weaknesses and needs to be seriously revised (Searle 8). Searle presents a list of what he regards as the basic categories of illocutionary acts. Searle categories are defined as follows:

1. Declarations are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance. Such as *I bet, I resign, This court sentences you to ten years, imprisonment, which puts the person into prison*. The speaker has to have a special institutional rule, in a specific context, in order to perform a declaration appropriately (Yule 53). As the examples bellow:

   (1) a. Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife

   b. Referee: You’re out!

   c. Jury foreman: We find the defendant guilty (Yule 53).

   In using a declaration, the speaker changes the world via words. They change the state of the world in an immediate way.

2. Representatives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Such as describing, claiming, insisting and predicting. Statements of fact, assertion, conclusion, and description, as on illustrated are all examples of the speaker representing the world as he/she believes it is (Yule 53). Here are some instances:

   (2) a. The earth is flat

   b. Chomsky did not write about peanuts
c. It was a warm sunny day (Yule 53).

In using a representative, the speaker makes word fit the world (of belief).

3. Expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels. Such as apologizing, praising, congratulating, and regretting. They express psychological states and can be a statement of pleasure, pain, likes, dislike, joy, or sorrow. As illustrated below they can be caused by something the speaker does or the hearer does, but they are about the speaker’s experience (Yule 53-54).

(3) a. I’m really sorry
    b. Congratulations!
    c. Oh, yes, great, mmmm, ssaaah (Yule 53-54).

In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the world. They express how the speaker feels about the situation. Another kind of statement that can be used in expressive are: thanking, welcoming, deploring.

4. Directives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. They are commands, orders, requests, and suggestions. As illustrated below they can be positive or negative (Yule 54).

(4) a. Give me a cup of coffee. Make it black.
    b. Could you lend me a pen, please?
    c. Don’t touch that (Yule 54).

In using a directive, the speaker attempts to make the word fit the world. They try to make the addressee perform an action.
5. Commissives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. They are promises, threats, refusals, pledges, and as shown some instances below they can be performed by the speaker alone, or by the speaker as a member of a group (Yule 54).

(5) a. I’ll be back

b. I am going to get it right next time

c. We will not do that (Yule 54).

In using commissives, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the word. They commit the speaker to doing something in the future.

E. Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

A different approach to distinguishing types of speech act can be made on the basis of structure. A fairly simple structural distinction between three general types of speech acts is provided. In English, of the three basic sentence types as shown, there is an easily recognized relationship between the three structural forms (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and the three general communicative functions:

6. You wear a seat belt

7. Do you wear a seat belt?

8. Wear a seat belt. (Yule 54).

Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have direct speech acts. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function we have an indirect speech act. Thus,
declarative used to make a statement is a direct speech act, but a declarative used to make a request is an indirect speech act. Moreover, Levinson stated that most usages of the request are indirect, whereas imperatives are rarely used to command or request (Mey 112).

As illustrated in some instances below. The first utterance is a declarative, when it is used to make a statement, as paraphrased in the second utterance, it is functioning as a direct speech act, when it is used to make a command/request, as paraphrased in the third utterance, it is functioning as an indirect speech act (Yule 55).

9. It’s cold outside
10. I hereby tell you about the window
11. I hereby tell you that you close the door (Yule 55).

The different structure can be used to accomplish the same basic function, as the instances bellow, where the speaker wants to addressee not to stand in front of the TV. The basic function of all the utterances in the first utterance is a command/request, but only the imperative structure in the first represent a direct speech act. The interrogative structure in the second is not being used only as a question, hence it is an indirect speech act. The declarative structures in the third and the fourth utterances are also indirect requests (Yule 55).

12. a. Move out of the way!
   b. Do you have to stand in front of the TV?
   c. You’re standing in front of the TV.
d. You’d make a better door than a window (Yule 55).

One of the most common types of indirect speech act in English, for instances:

13. a. Could you pass the salt?
   b. Would you open this? (Yule 55).

As shown in some instances above, it has the form an interrogative, but it is not typically used to ask a question, actually, we do not except only an answer, we expect action.

Indeed, there is a typical pattern in English whereby asking a question about the hearer’s assumed ability, can you? Could you?, or future likelihood with regard to doing something will you? Would you? Normally counts as a request to actually do something (Yule 55).

Indirect speech acts are generally associated with greater politeness in English than direct speech act. In order to understand why, it has to look at a bigger picture than just a single utterance performing a single speech act (Yule 55).

Here are some instances how to recognize indirect speech act below:

If it said to somebody,

14. a. Could you move over a bit?

   It is not expected that person to answer my question with:

   b. Yes, Or

   c. Yes, perhaps I could
And not budge an inch. On the contrary, it would be considered such an answer highly inappropriate, even though it is uttered a question formally characterized as such by word order, intonation etc. of the ‘Yes or No’ type. By contrast, did the person move but never answered the question as might be the case if the scene happened to be cinema or concert hall, it would be perfectly happy with his or her reaction or answer (Mey 111-112).

Here is an example originally due to Searle. Suppose somebody says to a friend:

15. a. Let’s go to the movies tonight. And the friend’s answer:

        b. I have to study for an exam. (Mey 112).

In the example above, that the second utterance, in fact, is a rejection of first person’s request. In the first, while seeming to be completely unrelated to it and not containing any overt or hidden expression of negation, denial or rejection, or even a mention of the rejected offer. There are two ways of approaching this problem. The first one is the philosophical semantic one. It is based on strict reasoning and certain basic principles of logic (Mey 112).
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

A. Data Description

The data used in this research is *Reasonable Doubt*’s transcript Movie. All the conversation and the transcript in the movie are read carefully. Then the researcher uses purposive sampling in this research. In purposive sampling, the researcher selects sampling units based on his or her judgment of what units will facilitate an investigation (Adler and Clark 121). The researcher uses this sampling because the researcher determines the data based on the considerations which focus on certain purposes or the aim of this research. The writer takes 30 illocutionary acts which uttered by several characters, they are: Mitch as a main character, Rachel, Davis, Stuart, Jimmy and Kanon, which took from several scenes in the conversation of Reasonable doubt movie. The data is classified according to Searle’s categories of the illocutionary act; representatives, directives, commissives, declaratives and expressives. Furthermore, the data is also described the perlocutionary act expected by the speaker in each conversation.

B. Data Analysis

Data1

A conversation between Mitch and her wife Rachel in their house as follows:
MITCH: Look up. Look up. Please. One more.

RACHEL: - No. Absolutely not.

MITCH: Look at those tiny little hands.

RACHEL: I know.

MITCH: I can't believe her. Looks so perfect. She's so peaceful. Thank you.

The context of this dialogue shows about the conversation when Mitch is in his house with his wife. There is also his daughter named Ella. When he wants to take a picture of his wife and his daughter then he says to his wife “Look up. Look up. Please. One more.” From the utterance, Mitch wants that his wife looks to the camera which there in Mitch’s hand so that Mitch can take a good picture by his cell phone. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Look up. Look up. Please. One more,” from that utterance Mitch also wants that Rachel to do some action.

Based on the context, the utterance contains directive illocutionary act “Look up. Look up. Please. One more,” and it classified into requesting. It means Mitch requests to Rachel to look to his camera because Mitch wants to take a picture of Rachel and Ella.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is succeeded because the hearer’s response is good and she follows his request. But when Mitch says “one more” Rachel answers “No. Absolutely not,” she refuses Mitch’s second request, in this utterances, Rachel does commissive illocutionary act.
Data 2

A conversation between Mitch and his friend in the street as follows:

**STUART**: Listen, when you throw up in the middle of the night, **aim away from your baby.**

**MITCH**: Yeah, I will.

The context of this dialogue takes place on the side of the street in the night when Mitch and his friends want to separate after drunk in a party. One of his friends Stuart, he says to Mitch “**Listen, when you throw up in the middle of the night, aim away from your baby.**” Then Mitch answers, “**Yeah, I will.**” This utterance shows that Stuart commands him to keep distance to his baby when he throws up in the night because he is still not sober. Stuart doesn’t want Mitch to disturb his baby because Mitch is not in a good condition at that time. The locutionary act is the utterances itself “**aim away from your baby.**”

Based on the context, that utterance contains **directive illocutionary act**“**aim away from your baby.**” and it classified into commanding. Stuart conveys his wish for the addressee to do something. His utterance is aimed at making Mitch do something. It means Mitch must be careful to keep his baby from the bad thing which can endanger her.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is he wants Mitch stay away from Ella and that perlocutionary act succeeds because the hearer’s response is good and follows the speaker’s command by saying “**yeah I will.**”
Data 3

A conversation between Mitch and an emergency call as follows:

E CALL: What's the location, sir?


EMERGENCY CALL: What's your name, sir?

MITCH: Please just hurry. Hurry, he's hurt real bad. Sir.

This dialogue happens after the accident of hit-and-run in the road happened when Mitch calls an ambulance for Cecil through a payphone. He says on the phone “Please just hurry. Hurry, he's hurt real bad. Sir.” from this utterance, the speaker aims to the hearer to do something, Mitch wants an ambulance or any other emergency things come to his place as soon as possible to help a victim who is in a real bad condition. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Please just hurry. Hurry, he's hurt real bad. Sir.”

Based on the context, certainly the utterance typed into the illocutionary acts of directive, “Please just hurry. Hurry, he's hurt real bad. Sir.” and it classified into requesting. The speaker conveys his desire to help the victim by calling an ambulance he didn’t want something worse happens to Cecil. Mitch’s utterance makes the receiver of call doing something to prepare an ambulance toward the location that the caller has told.

The illocutionary gets the expected perlocutionary effect because some minutes after Mitch calls an ambulance then the ambulance is coming. However,
the hearer’s response is still curious who the caller is because Mitch does not mention his name to the hearer he do not want that the hearer knows about himself who makes a call.

Data 4

A conversation between Mitch and his wife Rachel in his house as follows:

RACHEL: Something you wanna tell me? About last night?
MITCH: What?
RACHEL: And the car? And why it's parked in the garage? Did you drive home?
MITCH: Yeah.

The context of this dialogue is Rachel does not know what really happens with his husband because Mitch did not share the true story which happened in the road to her wife, his husband looks sad and feels worried. Then Rachel asks to him “Something you wanna tell me? About last night?” From that utterance, the speaker wants the hearer to answer her question. It means Rachel conveys Mitch to do an action to tell the chronology of the story in his office or anywhere because Mitch looks is not in a good mood. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Something you wanna tell me? About last night?”, but Mitch just responds “What?” Actually, Mitch does not want his wifeto know the true story about what really happen to him and it also signs of his shocked.

Based on the context, certainly the utterance contains directive illocutionary act, “Something you wanna tell me? About last night?”, and it
classified into asking. Directive illocutionary act is an act where the speakers use to get someone else to do something. It means Rachel aims to make Mitch tells about the real story and be honest to her.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is Rachel wants that Mitch answers her question. However, the hearer’s response is short and simple. He does not want someone to know about what he did at that night. The contradictory result occurs because Mitch feels afraid if there is someone knows that he hit someone by car and he did not want to make her wife is sad and worry so the perlocutionary act is not expected by the speaker. Based on the conversation above Rachel also frightens Mitch about something that she asked.

Data 5

A conversation between Honor and Robert in the court as follows:

ROBERT: Right away, your honor. He's been in the courtroom this entire trial.
MITCH: Your honor, please! Can I just please say some--?
HONOR: Enough! Call your witness.
ROBERT: The defense calls...Jimmy Logan to the stand.

The context of this conversation takes place in the court some minutes before the court session was begun. When Robert wants to present anew witness who is been in the courtroom, like Robert said “Right away, your honor. He's been in the courtroom this entire trial.” Then Honor responds “Enough! Call your witness.” From that utterance, the speaker orders the hearer to do something. The honor orders Robert to call the witness who is been in the courtroom. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Call your witness.”
Based on the context, absolutely the utterance contains the *illocutionary acts of directive, “Call your witness”* and it classified into ordering. The speaker conveys his order to the hearer to call a witness. From that order, Robert responds by saying “*The defense calls...Jimmy Logan to the stand.*”

The illocutionary gets the expected perlocutionary effect and it is based on the expectation because the hearer does what the speaker orders, the witness stands up soon like Robert orders to the witness that is Jimmy Logan.

**Data 6**

A conversation between Mitch and his step-brother Jimmy in the café as follows:

**MITCH:** I get busted breaking into some guy's fucking house--come on; I don’t want you breaking in. I'll break in. *I just need for you to tail him, let me know when he's coming back.*

**JIMMY:** Ah, it's just a little aiding and abetting then. Eh. Forget it, Mitch. Let it go. I'm done.

**JIMMY:** That fucker really breaks into your house?

**MITCH:** Yes. While we were sleeping.

The context of this dialogue takes place in the café when Mitch and Jimmy are meeting, that conversation shows that Mitch needs some help from his brother Jimmy. He wants Jimmy tailing Davis and telling him if Davis comes back home. As he says “*I get busted breaking into some guy's fucking house--come on; I don’t want you breaking in. I'll break in. I just need for you to tail him, let me know when he's coming back.*” From that utterance, the speaker requests to the hearer to do something about what he said because the speaker needs help from the
hearer. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I just need for you to tail him, let me know when he's coming back.”

Based on the conversation above, the utterance typed into the illocutionary act of directive, “I just need for you to tail him, let me know when he's coming back.” And it classified into requesting. Directive illocutionary act is an act where the speakers use to get someone else to do something. Mitch wants his brother does something for him.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker does not succeed because the hearer refuses Mitch’s request as Jimmy says “Ah, it's just a little aiding and abetting then. Eh”. Forget it, Mitch. Let it go. I'm done. But after several seconds, Jimmy comes back and accepts Mitch’s request. Finally, the perlocutionary act is based on the expectation of the speaker.

Data 7

A conversation in the phone between Mitch and Jimmy


JIMMY: Mitch! Help me! You gotta help me, Mitch! Help... Mitch.

MITCH: Yo, Jimmy!

JIMMY: Oh, please help me!

MITCH: Oh, Jesus Christ. Oh Jimmy.
The context in this conversation is a very dangerous situation, when Mitch and Jimmy are communicating through phone and when Mitch asking about how the situation to Jimmy, but when Jimmy answers Mitch’s question, suddenly Davis approaches Jimmy and then he hurts him by a hammer. In that emergency situation, Jimmy just can scream and really needs help from Mitch like he says “Mitch! Help me! You gotta help me, Mitch! Help... Mitch.” That utterance shows that the speaker requests the hearer to do some action because he is in a very bad condition in Davis’s hand. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Help me! You gotta help me, Mitch! Help... Mitch.”

Based on the context above, absolutely the utterance contains directive illocutionary act. “Help me! You gotta help me, Mitch! Help... Mitch.” and it classified into requesting. In that situation, Jimmy asked help from his brother Mitch because he is in a real bad or worse condition and he is in a very bad health with bloody body and face.

Illocutionary act meets the perlocutionary act and it is based on the expectation of the speaker because the hearer responds fast to Jimmy’s call. He helps Jimmy and then the ambulance is coming and the volunteer takes him to a better place and that is a hospital.

Data 8
A conversation between Mitch and emergency call in the phone as follows:

911 call: what’s your emergency?
MITCH: I need an ambulance. A guy's been hit by a car.

911: What's the location, sir?

MITCH: - Uh, Keeler. Keeler and 26th.

The context of this conversation takes place in the telephone, the situation of the conversation is when Mitch drives his car and suddenly he involves in a fatal hit and run on the road. He was very shocked then he looks for a payphone and calls an ambulance there. The receiver asks him “what's your emergency?” and He responds to the receiver of the call “I need an ambulance. A guy's been hit by a car.” This utterance Mitch describes the chronology of the accident in the road and he needs an ambulance. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I need an ambulance. A guy's been hit by a car.”

Based on the conversation above and based on the speech act theory, the utterance typed into representative illocutionary act, “I need an ambulance. A guy's been hit by a car” and it classified into asserting. It is one kind of speech act that states what the speaker believes to be the case or not. It means Mitch describes the incident to the call receiver of the emergency call and he hopes an ambulance comes immediately because the victim is in a very emergency situation. Then the hearer responds “What's the location, sir?”

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is the speaker wants the services that he needs come soon into the scene. In addition, the hearer’s response is good, she believes Mitch’s statement and she asks backs to him what the
location of the accident is. Several minutes after calling an ambulance then the ambulance is coming.

**Data 9**

A conversation between Mitch and Rachel as follows:

*RACHEL:* There's daddy. Hey, lover. What on earth are you doing up?

*MITCH:* I didn't sleep great.

*RACHEL:* Hangover?

*MITCH:* Yeah. How are you?

*RACHEL:* Well, apparently they wake up every two hours and they demand food. Who knew?

The context of this dialogue takes place in Mitch’s home a few moments after the accident happened, he communicates with her wife about why he wakes up earlier than usual, as Rachel says to Mitch “*There's daddy. Hey, lover. What on earth are you doing up?*” Then Mitch describes what he feels “*I didn't sleep great.*” The utterance shows that Mitch cannot sleep well all night because he thinks about the victim and he cannot share the true story to Rachel. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “*I didn't sleep great.*” Rachel just responds to Mitch’s utterance “*Hangover?*” Rachel just guesses what she knows from her husband that he after hangover so he cannot sleep well.

Based on the context, absolutely Mitch’s utterance contains representative illocutionary act “*I didn't sleep great*” and it classified into asserting. Mitch
asserts to his wife that his sleep did not great because there are so many thoughts in his minds after the accident in Keeler happened.

The perlocutionary act expected is good because the hearer believes Mitch’s statement and she gives a feedback by asking him back even though the true story was not shared by Mitch to Rachel. It occurs because Mitch does not want to see his wife feels sad and disappointed about what he has done.

Data 10

A conversation between Mitch and Kanon as follows:

KANON: Walk with me. Suspect's name is Clinton Davis. Car mechanic; couple of assault charges, nothing he did time for; no relatives; Wife and daughter were murdered in a home invasion a few years back. Priest was in here already, saying what a good guy he is, how he'd never hurt a fly, et cetera.

MITCH: They said on the news that he found Cecil Ackerman in the road.

KANON: Yeah, we've been there. No broken car parts, no blood that we could see.

MITCH: Yeah, but the snow thawed overnight, so...

KANON: We've got Ackerman's blood and hair all over Davis's clothes. We've got the bloody tools and the plastic sheets in the back of his van. We've got enough to charge him. You guys need to decide if it's enough to convict.

MITCH: He looks terrified.

The context of the dialogue takes place in Kanon’s room office when she informs to Mitch that the suspect’s name is Clinton Davis then she also mentions Davis’s characteristics and she tells what she and other detectives identified. Like she says “We've got Ackerman's blood and hair all over Davis's clothes. We've
got the bloody tools and the plastic sheets in the back of his van. We've got enough to charge him. You guys need to decide if it's enough to convict.” From Kanon’s utterance, it shows that she investigates that incident in the scene. Kanon says she and other detectives found Ackerman’s blood and his hair in Davis’s clothes and they also found the bloody tools in the back of Davis’s van. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “We’ve got Ackerman's blood and hair all over Davis's clothes. We’ve got the bloody tools and the plastic sheets in the back of his van.”

Based on the context above, certainly Kanon’s utterance contains representative illocutionary act “We've got Ackerman's blood and hair all over Davis's clothes. We’ve got the bloody tools and the plastic sheets in the back of his van.” and it classified into statement of fact. Kanon describes the fact that she investigated about Davis as a suspect; she found the strong evidence in suspect’s van.

In addition, the illocutionary act gets the perlocutionary effect because Mitch adds Kanon’s utterance as his belief or agreement to Kanon’s statement. So the perlocutionary act is based on the expectation.

Data 11

A conversation between Mitch and Davis in the D.A’s office

DAVIS: Just something I do. It's not against the law, right? I mean, don't you ever go out and drive around at night?
MITCH: Due respect, I think that's beside the point.

DAVIS: I don't like to spend too much time at home. It brings back memories--My wife and child.

MITCH: I heard what happened to your family. I'm--I'm sorry.

The context of the dialogue shows about the conversation between the suspect and the investigator they are Mitch, Stuart, and Robert. When Stuart asks a question about where Davis is when the accident happened then Davis answers he just does something that he usually does like driving, working, and grouping. He also says “I don't like to spend too much time at home. It brings back memories--My wife and child.” His utterance shows about his sorrow when he lost his family in the past hence he does not like spending time at his home. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I don't like to spend too much time at home. It brings back memories--My wife and child.”

Based on the context, absolutely the utterance contains representative illocutionary act “I don't like to spend too much time at home. It brings back memories--My wife and child” and it classified into asserting. Davis asserts what he believes about his bad experiences in the past years. His wife and his daughter died they were murdered by a serial killer.

The perlocutionary act succeeds and based on the speaker’s expectation because the hearer’s response “I heard what happened to your family. I'm--I'm sorry.” It shows that Mitch shows his respect and his condolence to Davis.
Data 12

A conversation between Mitch and Doctor in the court

MITCH: What else can you tell us about the caller?

DOCTOR: Hard to be certain from the quality of the tape. Sounded like a white male—possibly in his 30s—from the South of Chicago, but he's tried hard to soften the accent, not unlike yourself, counselor. Now you're from where, Riverdale?

MITCH: When you say it's hard to tell for certain...that the tape is unclear, that it seems to be a white male—

The context of the dialogue takes place in the court and the conversation occurs between the Doctor and Mitch, he asks some question such as how accurate forensic linguistics is and he also asks about the caller who calls in that accident as he says “What else can you tell us about the caller?” after that Doctor responds to Mitch’s question “Hard to be certain from the quality of the tape. Sounded like a white male—possibly in his 30s—from the South of Chicago, but he's tried hard to soften the accent, not unlike yourself, counselor. Now you're from where, Riverdale?” from Doctor’s utterance, the writers thinks that Doctor represents her investigation about the caller based on her understanding. She says that the caller comes from a white male and his age around 30 years old. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Hard to be certain from the quality of the tape. Sounded like a white male—possibly in his 30s—from the South of Chicago, but he's tried hard to soften the accent, not unlike yourself, counselor. Now you're from where, Riverdale?”
Based on the context, Doctor’s utterance contains the *illocutionary act of representative* and it classified into describing. She describes what she believes about the caller from the recording which she heard and she also frightens Mitch through her utterance.

The perlocutionary act does not succeed because the hearer’s response seems negates the speaker’s utterance. The contradictive result occurs because Mitch feels confuse which proved by Doctor is true that the sound is a white male.

**Data 13**

A conversation between Mitch and Davis in the phone

*Mitch:* What do you want?

*Davis:* Stop following me.

*Mitch:* I know what you did.

*Davis:* And yet the cops haven’t come a ‘calling. Why you think that is, Mitch?

*Mitch:* If you knew I was the driver, why didn’t you just turn me in, huh?

*Davis:* I didn’t want to play my ace in the police station. I needed to go to court. I had to get a jury of my peers to see your card, find me innocent.

This conversation tells about Davis’s request to Mitch who is always follows his way in everything he does but Mitch responds to him by saying “I know what you did.” Mitch’s utterance shows that he knows about what he did with all of his victims but nobody knowing that fact. Mitch believes about his investigation that Davis is a serial killer. But Davis responds “And yet the cops haven't come a ‘calling. Why you think that is, Mitch”? It means that he is a
suspect in that big accident of Ackerman’s case. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I know what you did.”

Based on the context, the utterance typed into representative illocutionary act “I know what you did” and it classified into asserting. Mitch asserts what he believes to be the case. He is sure that Davis is a serious killer who was not revealed by the police.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is the hearer feels threaten about the speaker’s utterance. However, the hearer’s response is not based on the expectation instead he answers that the police do not know yet. The contradictive result occurs because Davis still has a big plan for Mitch next.

Data 14

A conversation between Mitch and Davis through phone

DAVIS: Yeah, you will, or I will ruin you. Besides, who’s gonna protect Rachel and Ella when you get locked up for hit-and-run, hmm?

MITCH: What did you say?

DAVIS: Family is a precious thing, Mitch. It's our job as men to protect 'em.

MITCH: Davis

The context of the dialogue shows about Davis’s threat to Mitch who will ruin his life and also his family. Davis also says “Family is a precious thing, Mitch. It's our job as men to protect 'em.” It means Davis insists what he believes about the family he says that family is the most precious thing in life. The
locutionary act is the utterance itself “Family is a precious thing, Mitch. It's our job as men to protect 'em.”

Based on the conversation above, absolutely the utterance contains representative illocutionary act “Family is a precious thing, Mitch. It's our job as men to protect 'em” and it classified into insisting. He insists Mitch that family is everything and as the man, they must protect their family from a bad thing and dangerous thing. It is not only insisting something but also persuading, Davis’s utterance also contains threat which will he gives to Mitch next time.

The perlocutionary act that the hearer gives is shocked, because from Davis’s utterance surely Mitch’s family will be threatened. And Davis’s threat makes Mitch is fear so the perlocutionary act succeeds because he can frighten Mitch by his words.

Data 15

A conversation between Kanon and Mitch in Kanon’s room

KANON: So why turn on him now? Was he blackmailing you?

MITCH: What are you talking about? I didn’t do this. Clinton Davis did this.

KANON: Using your hammer?

MITCH: Yes. He broke into my house, he stole my tools.

KANON: Did you report that?

MITCH: - No- No.
The context of this conversation shows about Kanon’s utterance which accuses Mitch who did the case criminal. However, Mitch insists that he is not doing that and Davis actually did it. Then Kanon’s response is “Using your hammer?” so he responds “Yes. He broke into my house, he stole my tools.” that utterance means when Kanon asks about did Davis used his hammer when killing Ackerman, so Mitch asserts what he believes that Davis broke into Mitch’s house and Davis steals his tools included a hammer. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Yes. He broke into my house, he stole my tools.”

Based on the context above, Mitch’s utterance contains representative illocutionary act “Yes. He broke into my house, he stole my tools” and it classified into asserting. Mitch asserts what he believes to be the case that Davis is a serial killer, he killed many victims but the police do not know what actually happened.

The perlocutionary act succeeds and also it’s based on the speaker’s expectation because the hearer gives a good feedback by asking Mitch, “Did he report that incident to police.” However, Kanon seems not really sure about Mitch’s utterance because she does not find other evidence which can convince his utterance.

Data 16

A conversation between Mitch and Kanon in her office room
KANON: Ackerman was a hit-and-run, remember? The wounds were inconclusive. You yourself pointed that out at the trial.

MITCH: Inconclusive, exactly. What if it was both? What if Ackerman ran into the path of a car because he was trying to get away from Davis who was in the process of torturing him? It explains why the forensics was so confusing.

KANON: Anything else? Thanks for coming by.

The context of the dialogue takes place in Kanon’s room when Kanon tells that Ackerman was a victim of a hit and run but Mitch denies it he says “What if it was both? What if Ackerman ran into the path of a car because he was trying to get away from Davis who was in the process of torturing him? It explains why the forensics was so confusing.” The utterance means that Mitch convinces Kanon if Ackerman is a victim of hit and run and also a victim of someone’s murder. He believes Ackerman ran into the road because he was trying to get away from the murderer. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “What if Ackerman ran into the path of a car because he was trying to get away from Davis who was in the process of torturing him? It explains why the forensics was so confusing.”

Based on the context, the utterance typed into representative illocutionary act and it classified into insisting. He insists to Kanon about the fact which he believes that Ackerman is also a murderer’s victim.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is the hearer will understand and believe about the speaker’s utterance. However, the hearer’s response is not good and it looks that Kanon refuses Mitch’s statement. The
contradictive result occurs because Kanon is still confused what the truth of that case is.

**Data 17**

A conversation between Mitch and Cecil in the road as follows:

*Mitch*: Okay. Okay. Hey. Two minutes. I promise

*Cecil*: Don't leave me.

*Mitch*: Just gonna call an ambulance. *I'll be back in two minutes.*

During the accident just happened, Mitch is really confused what he must do to solve all the tragedy in that road but immediately he call an ambulance to help Cecil when he will call an ambulance he says “*Just gonna call an ambulance. I'll be back in two minutes.*” From that utterance, Mitch doesn’t only give a report but also he promises that he will back after two minutes. The locutionary act is the utterances itself “*I'll be back in two minutes.*”

Based on the context, certainly Mitch’s utterance contains the illocutionary act of commissive “*I'll be back in two minutes*” and it classified into promising. Commissive illocutionary act is an act where the speaker commits for the future action. It means Mitch commits to his utterance that he will back to Cecil in two minutes because he just calls an ambulance for a moment.

The perlocutionary act is succeeded although Cecil does not say something but his face indicates that he believes to Mitch’s utterance, and after two minutes Mitch proves his utterance that he comes back.
A conversation between Mitch and Cecil in the road as follows:

**MITCH:** I have to go. I can’t stay. I can’t stay. You’ll be fine. I promise. I promise. I’m sorry. An ambulance is coming, okay?

**CECIL:** Don’t leave me please.

The context of the dialogue takes place when Mitch wants to go home, he drives a car by himself but suddenly the accident happens. He hits someone on the road and his name is Cecil, after Mitch called an ambulance. He says to Cecil that he has to go and he cannot stay and he says to Cecil “You’ll be fine. I promise. I promise.” The locutionary act is the utterances itself “You’ll be fine. I promise. I promise” from that utterance, Mitch does not only give a report but also he promises that Cecil will be fine although Mitch cannot stay with him after that accident happens.

Based on the context, absolutely Mitch’s utterance contains *commissive illocutionary act* “You’ll be fine. I promise. I promise” and it classified into promising. Commisive illocutionary act is an act where the speaker commits for the future action. It means Mitch commits to his utterance that Cecil will be fine and tries to convince him that he will get well soon because the ambulance is coming.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is Mitch wants that Cecil believes and understands to Mitch about his utterance, Mitch wants Cecil is not worry and afraid because he has called an ambulance for Cecil. However, the hearer’s response is sad and worry, he does not want Mitch leaves him alone on the road by saying “Don’t leave me please.” The contradictive result occurs because Cecil as a victim needs help in that emergency situation. He feels like he
wants to be saved by someone so the perlocutionary act is not expected by the speaker.

Data 19

A conversation between Mitch and his wife Rachel in the home

Rachel: You promised to take a cab.

MITCH: I know.

Rachel: No, I mean-- What, are you crazy? Cause if you get a D.U.I., then you can kiss the D.A.'s office goodbye.

MITCH: I know, I know, I'm sorry. I shouldn't have. I won't do it again.

RACHEL: Mitch, I am serious. You're a father now, okay? You can't afford to take chances.

MITCH: I know. I'm sorry.

The context of this conversation takes place in the home when Mitch and Rachel communicated each other, Rachel asks question to Mitch about his promise that he will take a cab but Mitch doesn’t fulfill his promise. He drives a car by himself then Rachel shocked because many risks if he was intoxicated while driving and one of the risks is he can out from D.A’s office. Like Rachel says “No, I mean-- What, are you crazy? Cause if you get a D.U.I., then you can kiss the D.A.'s office goodbye.” Then Mitch responds “I know, I know, I'm sorry. I shouldn’t have. I won't do it again.” The locutionary act is the utterances itself “I won't do it again.” From that utterance, Mitch does not only give a report but also he promises to his wife he will not do it again and he realizes his fault and he apologizes to Rachel.
Based on the context above, certainly Mitch’s utterance contains the illocutionary act of commissive, “I won't do it again” and it classified into promising. It means Mitch commits to his utterance in the future action that he will not repeat his same fault because he was lying to his wife and he regrets about it.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is Mitch wants Rachel believes to him that he will not do some risks again which will endanger him or threaten other people. However the hearer’s response is still afraid, she doesn’t want Mitch in a dangerous situation. And she convinces him that he is a father of her baby so that she does not want Mitch affords to take risks. The contradictive result occurs because Rachel as his wife very cares and doesn’t want something bad happens to her husband. But afterward, Rachel forgives Mitch and believes to him.

**Data 20**

A conversation between Mitch and Jimmy as follows:

**JIMMY:** Yeah, I know. I was fucking stupid. Fuck, Mitch. I mean, Jesus, I was doing a lot of drugs back then. I was selfish. I've had a lot of fucking time to think about my life, think about who I was. Okay? Now I let you down. But I will not let you down again.

**MITCH:** Look... I met Rachel when I was graduating. She processed my application to the D.A.’s office.

**JIMMY:** Seeing as my ma never officially married your dad--yeah, you figured why mention us, right?

**MITCH:** Jimmy, it was best for me not to have ties to a criminal past, you know? Once I’d lied on the forms, I couldn't tell--
JIMMY: yeah, I get it. I understand.

This conversation happens when Mitch and Jimmy are meeting in one beautiful place. Mitch’s utterance shows his disillusion to Jimmy because Jimmy stumbled in a criminal case and then Jimmy realizes and recognizes what he did in the past he was doing a lot of drugs like he says “I was selfish. I’ve had a lot of fucking time to think about my life, think about who I was. Okay? Now I let you down. But I will not let you down again.” The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I will not let you down again.” From that utterance, Jimmy shows a promise to his step-brother Mitch in the future that he will not let Mitch down again.

Based on the situation above, this utterance certainly contains commissive illocutionary act “I will not let you down again” and it classified into promising. Commissive illocutionary act is an act where the speaker commits for the future action. It means Jimmy commits to his utterance that he tries to convince and he will not make Mitch down again because of his criminal act.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is the hearer believes about the speaker’s utterance that is he will not repeat some criminal case in the future like he did before. However the hearer’s response is angry and he convinces Mitch that he doesn’t want has any ties to a criminal past.

Data 21
A conversation in the court as follows:
MITCH: Before session begins, your honor, I would like to approach the bench.

HONOR: I will not tolerate tardiness, Mr. Roberts.

ROBERT: I'm sorry, your honor, but there has been an important development. Defense would like to call a new witness.

The context of this dialogue takes place in the court between Mitch, Honor, and Robert. The conversation happens when the session will begin but Robert as the defense arrives late to the court so that the Honor says to Robert “I will not tolerate tardiness, Mr. Roberts.” From the utterance shows that honor threatens Robert by his utterance because generally when the session begins all defenses must come on time and no one comes late. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I will not tolerate tardiness, Mr. Roberts.”

Based on the context, it is obvious that illocutionary act is commissive illocutionary act “I will not tolerate tardiness, Mr. Roberts” and it classified into threatening. Commissive commits to do something in the future. The Honor threatens Robert that he will not tolerate Robert’s tardiness.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is he wants the hearer realizes his tardiness because it’s one of a bad behavior then Robert realizes and he apologizes to Honor about his tardiness and he describes the reason why he is late. As he says “I’m sorry, your honor, but there has been an important development. Defense would like to call a new witness.” From that utterance the hearer denies the honor’s threat because he tells the truth what is really happen, Robert will call a new witness in that session. The contradictive result occurs because the hearer wants to show new information about the witness to the honor.
Data 22

A conversation between Davis and Mitch by phone

MITCH: Is this a fucking game to you?

DAVIS: Far from it.

MITCH: I won't let you get away with this.

DAVIS: Yeah, you will, or I will ruin you. Besides, who's gonna protect Rachel and Ella when you get locked up for hit-and-run, hmm?

MITCH: What did you say?

This conversation tells about when Davis calls Mitch by phone and he asks Mitch to stop following him but Mitch has to know what Davis did in that night to Cecil then he does not want surrender he always tries to prove that Davis is a very dangerous murderer. Like he says “I won't let you get away with this.” but Davis responds “Yeah, you will, or I will ruin you. Besides, who's gonna protect Rachel and Ella when you get locked up for hit-and-run, hmm?” Davis’s utterance doesn’t only give a report but also he threatens Mitch and it shows that he has a big plan for Mitch and he will ruin his family. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Yeah, you will, or I will ruin you. Besides, who's gonna protect Rachel and Ella when you get locked up for hit-and-run, hmm?”

Based on the context above, Davis’s utterance is obvious that his illocutionary act is commissive illocutionary act and it classified into threatening. Davis will ruin Mitch and his family and Davis also will let Mitch down.
The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is he wants the hearer feels threatened by his utterance and the hearer’s response is angry because he feels shocked and says “What did you say?” to ensure Davis’s utterance. He succeeds making Mitch feels threaten.

**Data 23**

A conversation between Mitch and Davis in the phone

MITCH: Stu, where the fuck have you been?

DAVIS: I'm sorry, Mitch. This is the only way they'd let me talk to you.

MITCH: Now you listen to me, you fucking son of a bitch. I will find you; I will come for you and I will take your life. You hear me, Davis?

The context of this dialogue shows about Davis confesses as Stuart through the phone in the police office, he did that because just that the only way he can talk with Mitch. As he says “I'm sorry, Mitch. This is the only way they'd let me talk to you. After that Mitch shocked and responds to him by saying “Now you listen to me, you fucking son of a bitch. I will find you; I will come for you and I will take your life. You hear me, Davis? Actually, Mitch’s utterance is a performative utterance because he does not only saying something but also doing something, the utterance means Mitch commits to the future action and he will find then he will kill Davis too. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I will find you; I will come for you and I will take your life. You hear me, Davis?”

Based on the context, it is obvious that *illocutionary act is commissive* “I will find you; I will come for you and I will take your life. You hear me, Davis?”
and it classified into threatening. Mitch threatens Davis’s life by his utterance. He will make Davis’s life is not peace.

The perlocutionary expected by the speaker is he wants the hearer feels threatened. However, the hearer responds by returning the fact to the speaker. The contradictory result occurs because Davis doesn’t want to admit himself that in truth dangerous murderer is him.

Data 24

A conversation in the court as follows:

MITCH: Neither fate nor society put Francis Mulligan in the house of Gloria Mitchell on the night of the 15th. Neither fate nor society told him to tie her up, shove a gun in her face and steal her belongings. That was his choice. The defense would have you walk in his client’s shoes. Well, I have. I’m from Riverdale. It's a craphole. Nobody's saying it’s not, but...that's where I’m from. It's not who I am. He is not the victim here. So if you are gonna put yourself in anyone's shoes...put yourself...in Gloria Mitchell's. Thank you.

JUDGE MCKENNA: The jury will now adjourn to deliberate a verdict.

STUART: Nice close. Straight to your top 5.

The context of this conversation takes place on the court when the session begins. It tells about when Mitch was executing his duty as a district attorney then the Honor declares something by saying “The jury will now adjourn to deliberate a verdict.” That utterance means the session will be adjourned in a moment by the jury. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “The jury will now adjourn to deliberate a verdict.”
Based on the context above, the Honor’s utterance is obvious that his illocutionary act is *declarative*. It defines of the session adjournment. Declarative is a kind of speech acts that changes the world via their utterance. Thus, that utterance is asserting includes in the case of paradigmatic case of a declaration, the speaker has to have a special institutional rule, in a specific context in order to perform a declaration appropriately.

In this case, Honor’s illocutionary act gives good feedback from the hearer, Mitch as a hearer also follows honor’s instruction and finishing his statement. The juries adjourn the session because they will deliberate a verdict. Therefore the way of this conversation is successful because the hearer’s perlocutionary act appropriates to the speaker illocutionary act.

**Data 25**

A conversation between Mitch and Jimmy as follows:

*JIMMY:* All right, he's gonna know your ride.

*JIMMY:* Can you rent me a clean set of wheels?

*MITCH:* Of course. Thanks Jimmy.

*JIMMY:* You know what? I mean that. I may be an asshole, but I'm still your brother.

The context of this conversation shows about Mitch’s request to Jimmy he needs help to Jimmy about tailing Davis’s home and Jimmy accepts his request. Mitch conveys his thankful to Jimmy and he responds by saying “*You know what? I mean that. I may be an asshole, but I'm still your brother.*” Jimmy’s
utterance means that he declares something to Mitch. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “You know what? I mean that. I may be an asshole, but I'm still your brother.”

Based on the context above, certainly the utterance contains declarative illocutionary act. Thus, that utterance is asserting includes in the case of paradigmatic case of declaration that is an admission. It means the speaker declares to the hearer, although Jimmy ever felt a cell because of the criminal case but he is still Mitch’s brother.

The perlocutionary act of the hearer is happy even though he does not say something but he seems very grateful about Jimmy’s utterance because jimmy wants to help him to succeed his plan in Davis’s home.

Data 26

A conversation between Mitch and Rachel in the home

MITCH: I can’t believe her. Looks so perfect. She’s so peaceful. Thank you.

RACHEL: We’re lucky.

MITCH: I'm sorry I have to go to this work thing tonight. I wish I could stay here with you.

The context of the dialogue takes place in Mitch’s home between Mitch and his wife. They communicate about how grateful and how lucky they are because they have a perfect and cute baby. However, in the middle of the conversation, Mitch says to his wife “I'm sorry I have to go to this work thing
tonight. I wish I could stay here with you.” That utterance means that Mitch apologizes to Rachel because he will go to work and he cannot stay with her tonight. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I'm sorry I have to go to this work thing tonight”.

Based on the context above, indeed Mitch’s utterance contains expressive illocutionary act “I'm sorry I have to go to this work thing tonight” and it classified into apologizing. Expressive commits to express what the speaker feels. Mitch utters his feeling directly to Rachel that he can’t stay with her at the time because he has some works to do in the office. The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is succeeded although Rachel did not say something to Mitch.

Data 27

A conversation between Mitch and Cecil on the road,

MITCH: What the fuck? Oh no. Oh, fuck. Oh, fuck. Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. Oh, fuck. I'm so sorry. Oh shit Hey, I'll get an ambulance.


CECIL: Don't leave me.

The context of this dialogue takes place in the road when the accident happened. When Mitch drives his car on a very quiet road, he seems not focus on his driving because he still in hangover condition. Suddenly the accident happens he hits someone on the road then he says to the victim “Oh no. Oh, fuck. Oh, fuck. Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. Oh, fuck. I'm so sorry. Oh shit Hey, I'll get an ambulance.” From that utterance, Mitch regrets about what he did before and he
asks to forgive to Cecil. The locutionary act is the utterance itself, “I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. Oh, fuck. I'm so sorry.”

Based on the context, this utterance certainly contains illocutionary act of expressive “I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. Oh, fuck. I'm so sorry.” Expressive is an act of the speaker feels. And it classified into apologizing. Mitch apologizes to Cecil about his fault because he did something seriously to him.

The perlocutionary act does not succeed because the hearer’s response is sad when Mitch wants to call an ambulance and the hearer or Cecil also does not want Mitch leaves him alone on the road because he is in the worst condition.

Data 28

A conversation between Robert, Mitch, Stuart and Davis in the D.A’s office

DAVIS: I don't like to spend too much time at home. It brings back memories--My wife and child.

MITCH: Uh yes, I heard what happened to your family. I'm-- I'm sorry.

The context of this conversation takes place in the D.A’s office when Mitch and his friends are meeting with Davis to interrogate him about what is really happen in that evening. When they ask some question to him about where is he was in the evening then he answers “Left work, went to group, and went for a drive.” He does not like to spend the time at home, as he says “I don't like to spend too much time at home. It brings back memories--My wife and child.” Then Mitch responds to Davis’s utterance “I heard what happened to your family. I'm-- I'm sorry.” From that utterance, Mitch shows his condoling to Davis about the
sorrow which happened to Davis. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “I heard what happened to your family. I'm-- I'm sorry.”

Based on the context above, Mitch’s utterance is obvious that the illocutionary act is expressive “I heard what happened to your family. I'm-- I'm sorry.” and it classified into condolence. It means Mitch express what he feels about Davis’s sorrow.

The perlocutionary act expected by the speaker is Davis can understand well about Mitch’s utterance and apologize. However, no response from Davis, instead he describes the murderer who killed his wife and his child.

**Data 29**

A conversation between Mitch and Stuart in the office:

**STUART:** The guy's name was Emanuel Fryer--career criminal; gunned down the following night during another home invasion; recently paroled; Blah blahblah.

**MITCH:** Broken home- oh shit.

**STUART:** What?

**MITCH:** Gonzales recently paroled. Fryer recently paroled. Ackerman was recently--all these men are recently fucking paroled. Stu, you are a goddamn genius! Shit. I love you. I love you.

The dialogue tells about when they are talking about the career criminals, then Stuart talks about Fryer who was recently paroled because of case murder as he says The guy's name was Emanuel Fryer--career criminal; gunned down the following night during another home invasion; recently paroled; Blah blahblah”
suddenly Mitch’s respond to Stuart’s utterance “Gonzales recently paroled. Fryer recently paroled. Ackerman was recently--all these men are recently fucking paroled. Stu, you are a goddamn genius! Shit. I love you. I love you.” The utterance shows that Mitch does not only give a compliment but he feels proud of Stuart who gives a genius thought about the case criminal. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “Stu, you are a goddamn genius! Shit. I love you. I love you.”

Based on the context, this utterance certainly contains the illocutionary act of expressive “Stu, you are a goddamn genius! Shit. I love you. I love you” and it classified into giving a compliment. Expressive commits to express what the speaker feels. Mitch gives the compliment toward Stuart and directly he expresses his love to Stuart because he has a genius mind. The perlocutionary effect is Stuart feels confuse about Mitch’s utterance and he does not say anything to Mitch. He just confuses what is really happen to Mitch.

Data 30
A conversation between Jimmy and Mitch in the cafe

JIMMY: All right, he's gonna know your ride. Can you rent me a clean set of wheels?


JIMMY: I may be an asshole, but I'm still your brother.

The context of this dialogue shows about Mitch who does a conversation with his step-brother Jimmy. Mitch and Jimmy have cooperated of reconnaissance
Davis’s home. At the beginning, Jimmy refuses Mitch’s request but at the end, he accepts Mitch’s help to tail Davis because Mitch wants to break Davis’s home. Mitch feels happy because Jimmy wants to help him like Jimmy says to him *All right, he's gonna know your ride. Can you rent me a clean set of wheels?* And Mitch’s responds “*Of course. Thanks Jimmy.*” *You know what? I mean that.* From this utterance, Mitch says thanks to Jimmy because he wants to help Mitch in that situation. The locutionary act is the utterance itself “*Of course. Thanks Jimmy.*”

Based on the context, Mitch’s utterance contains *expressive illocutionary act* “*Of course. Thanks Jimmy*” and it classified into thanking. Mitch expresses his thankful to Jimmy for his help to cooperate tailing Davis. The perlocutionary act of the hearer succeeds and the hearer also feels happy because Jimmy says that Mitch is still his brother so he must help him sincerely.

From the whole analysis above, the writer gives an argument that the success of perlocutionary acts more often occurred in this research than the failure of the perlocutionary acts. This is because the main character, Mitch Brockden in this data is a district attorney and indirectly he is esteemed by his friends, partners and also his wife. The overall conversations also usually occur in the court so that the speakers in that session like Mitch, Jury or Honor certainly have a power and the hearers must do what the speaker commands. However, there are also some data when the failure of perlocutionary acts occur, among which when Mitch communicates with the victim in the road. This failure occurs because the specific
situation makes it less possible for the interlocutor to fulfill Mitch’s illocutionary act. Unfulfilled perlocutionary acts often occur in a non court situation, especially in emergency situations. The only perlocutionary act not fulfilled in the court is when Mitch negates the speaker’s utterance because the content of illocutionary act is unclear.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the data analysis, the researcher concludes the results and the significances of this research as described below.

Firstly, the researcher has analyzed thirty data from the Reasonable Doubt’s movie transcript that are classified according to John. R. Searle’s theory of illocutionary acts. The first type is Directives which consists requesting, commanding, ordering and asking. The second type is representatives which contains asserting, describing, insisting, and statement of fact. The third type is commissives which consists promising and threatening. The fourth type is declarations which consists adjournment and admission. The last type is expressives which expresses apologizing, complimenting, condolence and thanking.

Secondly, the whole types of illocutionary act which occur in this conversation are averagely same so five types of illocutionary acts occur in this data analysis. However, the types of representative illocutionary act are more dominant in this research because, according to the setting and the situation of this film, representatives are more often occurred, to explain every case in the court. By stating the evidence or facts from the scenes and also insisting what are really happened about the real accident of hit and run in this film.
Thirdly, all the illocutionary acts in this conversation get many perlocutionary acts from the hearers. There are two kinds of perlocutionary acts which occur in this film they are success and failure, the success of perlocutionary acts more often occurred in this research than the failure of the perlocutionary acts. For example, when Mitch communicated with Jimmy “I just need for you to tail him, let me know when he’s coming back,” this utterance successfully meets the perlocutionary act because the hearers accept the speaker’s request. However, there are also some data when the failures of perlocutionary acts occur. This failure occurs because the specific situation makes it less possible for the interlocutor to fulfill Mitch’s illocutionary act such in an emergency situation.

B. Suggestion

After analyzing the data and summarizing the conclusion, the researcher suggests to linguistics students who want to do a research in pragmatic approach, they can explore deeper about speech act theory. In addition, other researchers can observe other media or clues such as body language to see whether the perlocutionary act is fulfilled or no.

Based on this research the writer hopes that there will be other researchers who will conduct the same topic to complete this research for linguistics development although in a different field. Moreover, the researcher hopes that this research will give a contribution to the readers a better understanding of speech acts, and can be an additional reference for those who are interested in learning more about speech acts.
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Look up. Look up.

- aim away from your baby.
- Yeah, I will.

Please just hurry. Hurry, he’s hurt real bad.
Something you wanna tell me?

Call your witness.

I just need for you to tail him,
let me know when he's coming back.

Help me!

I need an ambulance. A guy's been hit by a car.
- I didn't sleep great.
  - Hangover?

we've got Ackerman's blood and hair all over Davis's clothes.

We've got the bloody tools and the plastic sheets in the back of his van.
I don't like to spend too much time at home.

It brings back memories--

My wife and child.
Hard to be certain from the quality of the tape. Sounded like a white male--possibly in his 30s--
from the South of Chicago,

but he’s tried hard to soften the accent.

I know what you did.
Family is a precious thing, Mitch.

It's our job as men to protect 'em.
He broke into my house, he stole my tools.

What if Ackerman ran into the path of a car

because he was trying to get away from Davis
I'll be back in two minutes.

I promise. I promise.
I'm sorry.

I shouldn't have. I won't do it again.
But I will not let you down again.

I will not tolerate tardiness, Mr. Roberts.

or I will ruin you.
I will find you, I will come for you and I will take your life.

The jury will now adjourn to deliberate a verdict.

I may be an asshole, but I’m still your brother.
I'm sorry I have to go to this work thing tonight.

I heard what happened to your family.

Oh, I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry.
Stu, you are a goddamn genius!

Thanks, Jimmy.