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ABSTRACT

This research aimed to find out the types and functions of illocutionary acts produced by Peter Quill as the main character in Guardians of the Galaxy movie. The design of this research was descriptive qualitative. The researcher collected the data from Peter Quill’s dialogues and analyzed them by using Miles’ and Huberman’s interactive model source as the process of data analysis. The findings showed that there were four types of illocutionary acts found in Peter Quill’s utterances along with its functions: representatives (informing, notifying, reminding and asserting), directives (asking, requesting, telling, suggesting, ordering, forbidding, advising, and commanding), commissives (refusing and promising) and expressives (complimenting and complaining).
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A. INTRODUCTION

Language is a communication tool for human to convey messages by a speaker to the interlocutors. Sometimes, we are not only speaking or simply conveying a message. While uttering something, we frequently also do another action. When ever a speaker utters a sentence in an appropriate context with certain intentions, he or she performs one or more
illocutionary acts. Illocutionary act conveys a statement, bid, promise, question, apologize and many more. In this research, the researcher chose movie as the object to be observed. The movie analyzed in this research entitled Guardians of the Galaxy directed by James Gunn in 2014. The main character in this movie was a man named Peter Quill that had to live alone since he was a child because he was left by his parents. Peter’s leadership in a space mission used so many practices of illocutionary acts in his conversation. The researcher analyzed the types and functions of illocutionary acts found in Peter’s utterances by using Searle’s theory (1985).

B. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Illocutionary Acts by Searle

Searle (1976) postulates his alternative classifications of illocutionary acts along with its functions that were used as the main theory of this research. The classifications of illocutionary acts by Searle will be explained as the following:

a. Representative

Representative is the kind of illocutionary act that states what the speaker believes to be the case or not. According to Searle (1976) “the point or purpose of the members of the representative class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something being the case, to the truth of expressed proposition” (p. 354). The functions of representative acts are to assert, claim, affirm, state, deny, disclaim, assure, argue, inform, notify, remind, object, predict, report, suggest, insist, conjecture, hypothesize, guess, swear testify, admit, confess, accuse, blame, criticize, praise, complain, boast, and lament.

b. Directives

Directive is the kind of illocutionary act that the speaker uses to get someone else to do something. “The illocutionary point of these consist in the fact that they are attempts (or varying degrees, and hence more precisely, they are determinates of the determinable which includes attempting) by the speaker to get the hearer to do something” (Searle, 1976, p. 355). The functions of directives acts are to direct, request, ask, urge, tell, require, demand, command, order, forbid, prohibit, enjoin, permit, suggest, insist, warn, advise, recommend, beg, supplicate, entreat, beseech, implore, and pray. According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985) in Foundations of Illocutionary Logic, the directive point is to try to get other people to do things: in utterances with the directive point the speaker attempts to get the hearer to carry out the course of action represented by the propositional content (p. 37).

c. Commisives

Searle (1976) defines that “commisives are those illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker (again in varying degrees) to some future course of action” (p. 356). The functions of commissive acts are to commit, promise, threaten, vow, pledge, swear, accept, consent, refuse, offer, bid, assure, guarantee, warrant, contract, covenant, and bet. The commissive point is to commit the speaker to do something. The speaker commits himself to carry out the course of action represented by the propositional content (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 37).

d. Expressives

Expressives state what the speaker feels. The point of this act is to express “the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs
specified in the propositional content” (Searle, 1976, p. 356). The functions of expressive acts are to apologize, thank, condole, congratulate, complain, lament, protest, deplore, boast, compliment, praise, welcome, and greet.

e. Declaratives

Declarative aims to change the world via utterance. “Declaratives bring about some alternation in the status or condition of the referred to object or objects solely in virtue of the fact that the declarative has been successfully performed” (Searle, 1976, p. 358). In this act, the utterance is uttered by someone who is especially authorized to do: like judges, minister, boss, etc. The functions of declarative acts are to declare, resign, adjourn, appoint, nominate, approve, confirm, disapprove, endorse, renounce, disclaim, denounce, repudiate, bless, curse, excommunicate, consecrate, christen, abbreviate, name, and call. The declarative point is to change the world by saying so: in utterances with the declarative point the speaker brings about the state of affairs represented by the propositional content solely in virtue of his successful performance of the speech act (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 37).

2. Illocutionary Force and Propositional Content

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) state that illocutionary act basically consists of an illocutionary force and a propositional content. Illocutionary force refers to a speaker’s intention in delivering an utterance or to the kind of illocutionary act the speaker is performing such as statements, orders, predictions, requests, commands, promises, and apologies, whereas propositional content provides the content of the illocutionary act (p. 116).

3. Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFID)

Searle explains that the illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs) are supposed to be elements or aspects of linguistic devices which indicate either dependent on which conception of “illocutionary force and illocutionary act” are adopted: the utterance is made with a certain illocutionary force or else that it constitutes the performance of an illocutionary act (as cited in Yule, 1996, p. 49).

C. RESEARCH METHOD

Qualitative method aims to understand the social world in which we live and why things are the way they are (Hancock, Windridge, & Ockleford, 2009). Based on this explanation, this research used qualitative method as its purposes were to find out and explore more about the way human use language, which in this case, the practice of illocutionary acts produced in Guardians of the Galaxy movie. The data of this research were the utterances produced by Peter Quill that contained the illocutionary acts from Guardians of the Galaxy movie script directed by James Gunn in 2014. The instrument of this research was the researcher himself.

There were four steps done in collecting the data needed. The first step was the researcher watched Guardians of the Galaxy movie. Then, the researcher read thoroughly the movie script. Next, the researcher took notes of the utterances contained illocutionary acts produced by Peter Quill. As the last step, after all the data needed were gained, the researcher started to analyze the data.

In data analysis, the researcher used the analysis technique of interactive model source by Miles and Huberman (1994) consists of data reduction, data display, and conclusion
drawing. In data reduction, the researcher only used the utterances produced by Peter Quill character as the data. In data display, the data were displayed descriptively and along with its analysis. In the last step, after analyzing the findings, the researcher drew conclusion to answer the research questions.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Types and Functions of Illocutionary Acts Produced by Peter Quill

This section presented the types and functions of Illocutionary acts produced by Peter Quill as the main object in Guardians of the Galaxy movie. Of all the five types of Searle’s illocutionary acts, there were only four types found in Peter Quill’s utterances.

a. Representative

Representative is the kind of illocutionary act focuses on what the speaker believes to be the case or not.

(1) Informing is to assert the hearer with additional preparatory condition in which the hearer does not know what he or she is being informed of.

Time: 00:08:46 – 00:08:51
Act: Korath: What is your name?
Peter: My name is Peter Quill, okay?

This utterance contained the representative as ‘informing’ from Peter to Korath: Peter informed Korath about his name (identity).

(2) Notifying is to assert the hearer with the additional mode of achievement in order to put notice on the hearer.

Time: 01:04:33 – 01:06:47
Act: Peter: Yondu! Yondu. This is Quill! My coordinates are 227K324. Yondu: Hearing and come to Peter’s coordinate.
Peter: If you’re there, come get me, I’m all yours.

As the hearer, Yondu needed to be put on notice legally about the exact location of Peter. Here, the person who had the duty of notifying Yondu was Peter.

(3) Reminding is to assert the additional preparatory condition that hearer once knew and might have forgotten the propositional content (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 185).

Time: 00:54:29 – 00:54:46
Act: Peter: No, no, no, no! 4 billion units! Rocket! Come on, man. Hey! Suck up for one more lousy night and you rich.

Rocket: Fine.

Peter used the illocutionary acts of representative to remind Rocket to stay focus on their main purpose. Peter’s aim to remind Rocket worked which was indicated by Rocket agreed to his words.

(4) Asserting is to assert names the illocutionary force of assertion. The speaker has the right to ask the hearer to do something without any refusal (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 183).

Time: 00:45:33 – 00:45:46
Act: Peter: Hey! Nobody is killing anybody on my ship! We’re stuck together until we get the money.
Drax: I have no interest in money.
Peter: Great.

When Peter uttered his intention that no one was allowed to kill anyone in front of him, this utterance emphasized the function of representative as ‘asserting’ to
his hearers, Gamora and Drax. Peter asserted a certain condition if both (Gamora and Drax) wanted to finish their mission together with Peter, then they had to follow Peter’s condition. His utterance contained ‘asserting’ function because Peter allowed no refusal within his words that Gamora and Drax had to agree to his condition.

b. Directives

Directives is the kind of illocutionary act that the speaker uses to get someone else to do something.

(1) Asking has two uses or functions. One is in the notion of asking a question and the second is in the notion of asking someone to do something.

Time: 00:45:33– 00:45:46
Act: Rocket: 5, 4, 3...
Peter: No! Wait, hold on! Rocket, it’s me, for God sakes! We figured it out! We’re fine!
Rocket: Oh, hey, Quill. What’s going on?

In this utterance of Peter, the researcher found the directive which was ‘asking’ Rocket to stop his attack because he was in the plane.

(2) Requesting is a directive illocutionary that allows for possibility of refusal.

Time: 00:45:33– 00:45:46
Act: Rocket: Yondu
Peter: Do not open that Orb. You know that, right? You’ve seen what it does to people.

A request can be granted or reproduced by the hearer (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 199) which in this case, Peter’s request (for not opening the mysterious ball) was refused by Yondu which made Peter’s utterance included as ‘requesting’.

(3) Telling is both assertive and directive to tell a hearer to do something in a manner or mode which does not give him or her the option of refusal (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 200).

Time: 00:42:15– 00:42:23
Act: Peter: Yeah! There it is. Get my ship. It’s the Milano, the orange and blue one over in the corner.
Rocket: They crumpled my pants up into a ball.
Peter: That rude!
Rocket: They folded yours.

Peter tried to figure the problem by ‘telling’ his friends to get into his plane. In his utterance, Peter used the function of ‘telling’ as his way to solve the problem that his hearer, Rocket should do a favour to get his ship so that they could escape from the prison. Peter told (‘telling’) Rocket to do something that would benefit both of them.

(4) Suggesting is the utterances by the speaker to influence the hearer to follow the view of speaker.

Time: 01:00:24– 01:00:39
Act: Peter: Right, right, okay. I think you’re right. Or we could give it to somebody who’s not going to arrest us. Who’s really nice?
Peter: For a whole lot of money. I think it’s really good balance between both of your point of view.
Gamora: You’re despicable, dishonorable and faithless!
The ‘suggesting’ part by Peter was to figure his problem by influencing his friends to give the ball to other people.

(5) Ordering is when a speaker orders his or her hearer to do something simply in virtue of one’s position of power, whether or not that power is institutionally sanctioned (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 201).

Time: 01:41:47–01:46:03
Act: Peter: Listen to these words. Now bring it down hard!
Ronan: What are you doing?
Peter: Dance-off, bro me and you. I am distracting you, you big turd blossom.

Peter wanted to distract Ronan’s attention with the purpose to take back the mysterious ball by asking Ronan to repeat what Peter did, like in the words “listen to these words. Now bring it down hard!” Peter placed himself as someone who posed higher position from Ronan by inserting the function of ‘ordering’ within his utterance.

(6) Forbidding is the propositional negation of ordering.

Time: 00:11:55–00:11:59
Act: Bereet: Peter, you have called.
Peter: No, wait, don’t!

Peter warned Bereet for not answering that call because it was from Yondu and Peter did not want to talk with him. Due to Peter’s feeling of not wanting to take the call, he used the function of ‘forbidding’ into his utterance so that Bereet as his hearer followed his order of not giving the call to him.

(7) Advising is when the speaker asks hearer to do something which the speaker presupposes is in the hearer’s interest (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 202).

Time: 00:29:38–00:29:48
Act: Peter: Hey! Hey, hey, hey! Hey!
Rocket: Oh, crap.
Peter: You know, if killing Ronan is truly your sole purpose, I don’t think this is the best way to go about it.

Drax: Are you not the man this wench attempted to kill?
The researcher identified this dialogue as ‘advising’ because Peter figured out his problem with Drax by advising Drax to cancel his intention to kill Gamora.

(8) Commanding requires the speaker to be in a position of authority over the hearer and not simply of the power.

Time: 01:17:09–01:17:50
Act: Peter: Come on. Yondu is gonna be here in 2 seconds. He expects to hear this big plan of ours.

Drax: To do what?

Peter gave a command towards his team to do something according to what he wanted. It was clear that the utterance was command, which included in directive. This utterance happened because Peter as the speaker positioned himself higher (as the commander of his team) than his hearer which gave him the right to produce an utterance of commanding.
c. Commissives

Commissive is the kind of illocutionary acts that the speakers use to commit themselves to some future action.

(1) Refusing is the negative counterpart and consenting, are rejections and refusals that have the additional preparatory condition that one has been given the option of acceptance or refusal (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 195).

Time: 01:21:06 – 01:21:19
Act: Rocket: There’s one more thing we need to complete the plan. That guy’s eye.

Peter: No! No, we don’t. No, we don’t need that guy’s eye.

Rocket: No, seriously, I need it? It’s important to me.

Rocket asked Peter to take someone’s eyes for his plan of escaping from the prison, but Peter refused it because he thought that was not necessary. The speaker (Peter) expressed the refusal towards Rocket’s request.

(2) Promising always makes a hearer to do something for the speaker’s benefit, and involves a rather special kind of commitment, namely an obligation.

Time: 00:42:41 – 00:42:46
Act: Peter: Get them to the ship. I will be right back.

Gamora: How are you gonna possibly....

Peter: Just keep the Milano close by.

Peter used this utterance of commissive to have a good talk with Gamora by promising that he would be back immediately so that Gamora would do a favour for Peter: to get to the ship ahead of Peter.

d. Expressives

Expressives is the kind of illocutionary acts that state what the speaker feels.

(1) Complimenting presupposes that the thing the hearer is being complimented for good though it needs not necessarily be good for him (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p. 215).

Time: 01:13:50 – 01:14:06
Act: Peter: If you kill me now, you are saying goodbye to the biggest score you have ever seen.

Yondu: The Stone? I hope you got something better than that.

Peter’s utterance was classified into ‘complimenting’ because according to the explanation of compliment by Searle, which is to express approval of hearer for something: the speaker (Peter) expressed the compliment act towards Yondu.

(2) Complaining is when one is expressing discontent about is bad, though this needs not strictly be a presupposition since one can complain simply by saying that it is bad.

Time: 00:20:36 – 00:20:45
Act: Police: Hey! If it isn’t Star-Prince.

Peter: Star-Lord, man.

Police: Oh, sorry. “Lord.”

This conversation happened when Peter was caught by the police and they mistakenly mentioned Peter’s name. This caused Peter to complain about his name. Peter’s utterance was classified into complaining because as the speaker (Peter) expressed the ‘complaining’ act towards the police.
2. Discussion

There were four types of illocutionary acts produced by Peter Quill as the main character in Guardians of the Galaxy movie. First was the representatives type which functioned as ‘informing’: in the utterances when Peter informed his identity to Korath, ‘notifying’: Peter used ‘notifying’ utterance in order to save himself from being stucked in his plane. He notified Yondu about his exact location so that he could escape from the falling plane he was in at the moment. Here, Peter realised that Yondu (no matter what) would definitely come to get him because at that time he was being chased by Yondu, ‘reminding’: Peter as the commander of his team, used the ‘reminding’ function in his utterance to solve the problem between Rocket and Drax. He reminded Drax that there was another matter to be focused on rather than having fight with Drax. The last function in representatives act was ‘asserting’: Peter used the utterances of asserting to stop Gamora and Drax from killing each other for it would cause him such trouble.

The second type of illocutionary acts found in Peter Quill was directive. The functions of directive worked as ‘asking’: Peter asked Rocket to stop his attack towards his plane because he was in that plane. By using the ‘asking’ utterance, Peter was able to save himself from being injured, ‘requesting’: Peter once promised Yondu to give him mysterious ball, but with one condition that requested Yondu to not open the orb. Here, because his utterance functioned as ‘requesting’ Yondu had the right to refuse Peter’s request which he (Yondu) did refuse it. In the functions as ‘telling’: Peter as the speaker, used the function of ‘telling’ in his utterance to escape from prison by telling his friends to get his ship, Milano, ‘suggesting’: once again, Peter solved his problem by using the function of ‘suggesting’ within his utterance by influencing his friends to give the mysterious ball they had obtained to the people who would not arrest them.

Directive acts still continued to these functions, ‘ordering’: Peter wanted to get back the mysterious ball from Ronan that made him used the utterance of ‘ordering’. He ordered Ronan to follow his words as a commander that distracted Ronan’s attention, ‘forbidding’: Peter did want to talk with Yondu so he (Peter) forbidded Bereet from taking the phone call at that time. This was because Peter suspected that phone call was from Yondu, ‘advising’: when Drax attempted to kill Gamora, Peter stopped Drax by ‘advising’ him that killing Gamora would give Drax no benefit at all which only wasted him time and energy, and the last was ‘commanding’: as the commander of his team, Peter had more duties of solving problems comparing with his members, therefore he used the utterance of ‘commanding’ towards his members to find the escape plan from Yondu’s plane.

The third type of illocutionary acts was commissives which covered the functions as refusing and promising. In the utterance of ‘refusing’: Peter refused Rocket’s request to involve (took) someone’s eyes as part of their escape plan by saying that it was not needed, while in the ‘promising’ utterance: in order to convince Gamora to follow his plan, Peter promised Gamora that he would be back as soon as possible after he did the things he had to do. At last, the fourth type of illocutionary act used by Peter Quill was the expressives. This type (expressives) contained two functions as complimenting and complaining. In the ‘complimenting’ function: Peter used the utterance of ‘complimenting’ in order to save himself from being killed by Yondu. He complimented Yondu for acted cleverly if only he decided to cancel his plan of killing Peter. This utterance of Peter somehow implied that Yondu had always been clever and he made sure that this time, Yondu would act the same. For the function as ‘complaining’: when the police arrested Peter, they mistakenly mentioned his name. This moment made Peter to complain about mentioning his name mistakenly. The police as Peter’s hearer made him to produce the utterance of complaining as the result of their action (the police).
E. CONCLUSION

Based on the theory of illocutionary acts by Searle (1976), this research found out that Peter Quill produced four types of Illocutionary acts. This happened because Peter as a commander had to command his team towards their purposes which was meeting Ronan. As a commander, Peter produced the commissive, representative, directive and expressive acts in forms of informing, notifying, reminding, asserting, asking, requesting, telling, suggesting, ordering, forbidding, advising, commanding, refusing, promising, complimenting, and complaining. Yet, there was one kind of illocutionary act which was not used by Peter Quill: declarative. This type of illocutionary act was not found because Peter Quill could not guarantee all of his utterances among the reality and propositional content to become real with his interlocutors.

REFERENCES


