

Illocutionary Acts in *Lost in Thailand* Detective Humor Movie

Subandi^{1,*} Herina Endah Pangesty¹ Galih Wibisono¹

¹ Mandarin Education Program, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: subandi@unesa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The meaning of a speech is not always identical with the structure of the speech form and it cannot only be traced based on types also its constituent of internal elements. It is because the meaning of speech has a correlation between speech and the actions that the speaker is doing. The external element of speech has a significant role in forming the function and meaning of speech. It is same as the results of the research on the characters' utterances in the *Lost in Thailand* 《人再囧途之囧》 detective humor movie, it found the types of speech which the function is not compatible with the basic function of the speech type. The results of the research show that there are types of expressive speech, assertive speech, directive speech, commissive speech, and declarative speech. Furthermore, each type of speech is described according to its functions include; 1) deliberately to discourage speech partners; 2) criticize directly using harsh words; 3) used as an expression of emotional feelings; 4) used as a protection against opinion, and 5) to accuse the speech partner on purpose. The shifting of meanings and functions from the basic meanings and functions of each type of speech is more due to the external elements of the speech including the relevance and suitability of the context of the place or space, following the purpose of illocutionary acts, and the relationship between speech partners.

Keywords: *Types of Speech, Speech Functions, Internal Elements, External Elements, Basic Functions*

1. INTRODUCTION

Humans as social being always carry out interaction activities between humans and use language to convey ideas and feelings. [1] stated that humans can communicate what they are thinking also express their feelings as well as attitudes to other people. It means that the language tend to do its role as a pragmatic function which is more active and emphasized function of language as communication tools in daily life. [2] also stated the same argument that the linguistic interaction occurs in one or more forms of speech involving two parties include speakers and interlocutors who are in the one main utterance, in a certain time, place and situation as the realization of a speech event (see also Malinovski in [3] about language as a pragmatic function).

The use of language in communication activities is a form of illocutionary acts. It is an action that is actualized the activities through the form of speech. [4]

stated that the illocutionary acts are narrative actions carried out by speakers against interlocutors with purposes and objectives. Moreover, [5] also stated that the language which carries out a pragmatic function is closely tied to speech situations. Therefore, in carrying out speaking activities, a speaker is certainly not only producing a series of utterances but also he/she should be able to select and use speech appropriately according to the situation of the speech so that the purpose and objectives can be accepted by the interlocutors. The meaning of a speech is closely tied to the speech situation that forms it.

The choice and use of speech are surely referred to complete the demands of a speech situation that preserves speech events such as an obedience aspect to the principle of language politeness. With various purposes, the obedience to the principle of politeness becomes a requirement. However, both in real life and the fictional life such as in a movie, we often watch it as the work of thinking and imagination which are representing the real life. Also, there is a form of

violation to the principle of politeness. [6] conveys that the emergence of various speech in social life is a real fact. For example, the movie of *Lost in Thailand* 《*再囧途之囧*》 which is a humorous adventure genre. In the movie, there are speeches of characters who violate the maxims of politeness principles. For instance, the excerpts of speech by the characters, Xu Lang (XL) and Wang Bao (WB), on the train. WB shouted and burst out his anger at XL for dropping the flash disk.

WB: 帮我种健康树

Bāng wǒ zhǒng jiànkāng shù

Bantu aku menanam pohon kesehatan

Help me plant a health tree!

XL: 好

Hǎo

Baik

Alright!

If we reviewed the speech above, according to the pragmatic analysis framework (see also [7]) of politeness principle [8], WB's speech is a violation of the generosity maxims because through this speech it indicates that WB is trying to take advantage of itself by taking advantage of XL's situation which needs a picture of the temple that he has been looking for so far. The directive speech of WB is clearly detrimental to XL. Therefore, the illocutionary acts in the movie of *Lost in Thailand* can be studied using the illocutionary action theory which proposed by Searle [9]. By the technique of analysing the data, it considers and connects the related speech situations [10] [11] [12] [5]. Searle [8] stated that the classification of illocutionary action with regard to the politeness principle includes 5 functions according to the type of illocutionary acts [13] [14].

1.1. Speech Situation

The occurrence of speech is always initiated by the situation of the speech. It is due to the situation which is the cause of the speech occurred. [10] stated that speech is the effect meanwhile the speech situation is the cause. [15] and [16] argue that the speech is also formed and created by certain situations in communication so that there is no speech without speech situations. Thus, studying illocutionary acts must consider the speech situations because the true meaning of speech can only be identified through the speech situation that supports it. [17] expressed that determining the meaning of speech without paying attention to the situation of speech is a step that does

not bring adequate results. In this regard, [8] classifies 5 components of speech situations include covering, speech participants consisting of speakers (both the speaker and interlocutor); the context of the speech; purpose of speech; illocutionary action; and speech [10].

1.2. Illocutionary Actions

An illocutionary action is the whole language and non-language components include intact language actions which involve the speech participants in the speech event, the delivery form of speech, the topic, and the context. [18] stated that all linguistic and non-linguistic components will become a complete unit then form the overall meaning of the speech text [19]. Furthermore, [20] emphasized that a speaker does not merely say something by saying the utterance in producing a speech. In acting, the speaker also takes an action. Thus, doing illocutionary acts beside of producing a speech itself, it is also considered taking actions at the same time.

[21] divided illocutionary acts into three types. Illocutionary action is one of the types. Illocutionary action (*l'acte illocutoire*) is an illocutionary act that aims to say or inform something and is used to do something. The illocutionary act is known as the act of doing something. It is an illocutionary act that contains purposes and objectives [22]. The purpose and objectives or the power of speech are trying to influence the interlocutor by doing something about the speech. Illocutionary acts relate to whom we speak with, when and where the illocutionary acts are performed. Further, [23] divides illocutionary acts into five categories, namely representative or assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative [24].

1.3. The Functions of the Politeness Principle Violation

A violation in general has a bad meaning and is often avoided by many people. Including illocutionary acts, violations of a principle that is relevant to the politeness aspect are often avoided by speakers [25]. The violation of politeness principle is an indicator of improper speech [10]. However, in certain speech situations, a violation is needed as an illocutionary act strategy [26]. [8] also stated that violations of the politeness principle in certain speech situations are conducted because the violation has a function showed in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Indicator of Leech Courtesy Principle Violation Functions

Maxim Types	Violation Function Indicator
Wisdom	1. Threatening, rebuking, dan intimidating to frighten partner.
	2. Accusing the speech partner as if the partner has done something bad.
Generosity	1. Taking advantage of ignorance, providing false information for their own benefit.
	2. Taking advantage of the situation to take the advantages.
	3. Defending oneself such as avoid the accusations.
Compliment	1. Satire and criticize.
	2. Mocking and condescending to others.
	3. Deprecate speech partners.
	4. Lower self-esteem.
	5. Undercutting the ability.
	6. Body shaming.
Modesty	1. Boast of wealth.
	2. Boast of skills.
	3. Arrogant
Agreement	1. Expressing disagreement and not appreciating ideas conveyed by the speech partner.
	2. Protest the action.
Sympathy	1. Lack of sympathy or showing antipathy.
	2. Showing the ignorance.

2. METHODS

This study is a descriptive qualitative research. The research data of this study is 31 utterances carried out by the characters in the *Lost in Thailand* 《人再囧途之泰囧》 movie as speech pieces that violate the principles of politeness in total. Furthermore, the data are identified to determine the type and function of speech according to the classification of Searle's speech types and the Leech's politeness principle violation function. There are data results obtained in this study, In each type of illocutionary action, there are 3 data of declarative, 7 data of assertive, 11 data of expressive, 4 data of commusive, and 6 data of directive. Description of each type of illocutionary acts is presented in the result section. Then, the data were analysed based on the speech situation to find the function of the speech according to the type of each illocutionary act.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Declarative Illocutionary Acts

Based on the classification results, they are found only 1 data which fulfils the criteria of sympathy maxim violation as the type of declarative illocutionary acts. According to the analysis results, this speech aims to reveal the meaning of **deciding**, as follows. Context: The speech performed by Xu Lang (XL) and his wife (IXL) and it takes place in the office. IXL asks XL a signature for a divorce letter. Also, she tells XL that their child is sick.

IXL1: 你已经推了七次了, 她一直在等你你知道吗?

Nǐ yǐjīng tuīle qī cìle, tā yīzhí zài děng nǐ nǐ zhīdào ma?

Kau telah menundanya sebanyak 7 kali, apa kau tahu dia sudah menunggumu sepanjang waktu?

You've been putting it off 7 times. Do you know he has been waiting for you this whole time?

XL1: ①我现在不能签离婚协议 我赶不上飞机了。②我不能签 我真的不能签、我不解释了。③我这四年所有的心血, 是所有你知道吗?

Wǒ xiànzài bùnéng qiān líhūn xiéyì wǒ gǎnbùshàng fēijīle. Wǒ bùnéng qiān wǒ zhēn de bùnéng qiān. wǒ bù jiěshìle. Wǒ zhè sì nián suǒyǒu de xīnxuè, shì suǒyǒu nǐ zhīdào ma.

①Aku tidak bisa menandatangani surat cerai sekarang, aku akan ketinggalan pesawat. ②Aku tidak bisa tanda tangan, aku benar-benar tidak bisa tanda tangan. ③ Kamu tahu, kerja keras saya selama 4 tahun adalah segalanya!

①I can't sign the divorce letter now. I'll miss my flight. ② I can't. I really can't sign now. ③ You know what? My hard work in 4 years is my everything! (00:02:34-00:02:38)

XL1's speech fulfils the violation category of maximum sympathy because XL does not respond to the child's condition as a sympathy form such as showing a concern or asking about his child's condition after hearing that his child is being injured due to a fight with his friend. However, another side of the XL1's speech, it indicates that XL asks IXL to better understand to XL's working conditions which are marked by speech ① and speech ③. Next, if it is reviewed based on the speech function, XL's speech above has a function to "deciding" that is to decide not to sign the divorce papers requested by IXL which are indicated to the speech ① and ②. The function of deciding is one of the sub-functions of declarative illocutionary acts.

3.2. Assertive Illocutionary Acts

There are 3 sub functions found in the assertive function include “declare”, “presume”, and “explain” sub functions. The following is an explanation of the data and each of the sub functions is described as follows.

3.2.1. Declare

Context: The speech occurred in the hotel room. WB (Wang Bao) asks XL (Xu Lang) to watch a ladyboy show but XL is not interested.

XL: 一群大老爷们儿 有什么好看的

yīqún dà lǎoyémen er yǒu shé me hǎokàn de

Mereka semua adalah laki-laki, apa yang menarik?

They are all men. What’s interesting?

WB: 啊 人妖是男的

a rényāo shì nán de

Ah jadi waria itu sebenarnya adalah laki-laki?

Oh, I see. Then, those ladyboys are actually men? (00:19:13-00:19:17)

XL's speech is a form of speech that violates the discussion maxims because it shows XL's disagreement on WB's speech that invites him to see a ladyboy show. Thus, with '什么 好看的' 'shenme haokande' (what is interesting?) XL does not mean to ask but he to declare a disagreement on WB's invitation. WB thought that the famous show as one of the tourist attractions in Thailand would be interesting. According to the type of illocutionary function, XL's utterances have a function to **declare** the expression of 'disinterest' and 'rejection'; in the other hand, the physical form of XL's speech functions as a reason for the rejection statement. Based on the XL' speech, it means that XL intends to state that the show is not worth to be watched.

3.2.2. Presume

Context: Gao Bo (GB) used to be XL's best friend who is competing for the sympathy and support of Lao Zhou (LZ). When XL was talking to his wife in the room, suddenly BG came in and cut off the conversation.

GB1: 老周有信儿了

lǎo zhōu yǒuxin ér le

Apa ada kabar dari LZ?

Is there any news from LZ?

XL1: 没有啊

méiyǒu a

Tidak ada.

Nothing.

GB2: 听说风投你都谈好了

tīng shuō fēng tóu nǐ dōu tán hǎole

Saya dengar kamu sudah bersepakat dengan perusahaan modal ventura.

I heard that you agreed with a venture capital company.

XL2: 没有啊

méiyǒu a

Belum.

Not yet.

GB3: 那这是要去哪儿啊

nà zhè shì yào qù nǎ'er

Lalu kamu mau pergi kemana?

Then, where will you go?

(00:03:21-00:03:36)

As we know, the relationship between both of them are competing each other to get supports from LZ. All of GB's utterances can be perceived as having a tendency to cheat. If XL notifies LZ's existence to GB, it is possible that GB will go to meet him and leave XL immediately. Besides, XL himself want to meet LZ soon. It means that GB wants to take advantage of information from XL to fulfill his own needs. In sum, GB prioritizes his importance and ignores XL. When GB conveyed the speech, he was not sure whether XL had information where LZ was so GB's speech is kind of a presumption, presupposition, prejudice or even suspicion. Therefore, GB's speech reveals the **assumption** or even **presume**.

3.2.3. Explain

Context: While eating, Wang Bao (WB) told about his pancake business and XL thinks that the business could be very successful.

XL: 你把配方卖给我吧

nǐ bǎ pèifāng mài gěi wǒ ba

Bagaimana jika kamu menjual resepnya kepadaku?

How about you sell the recipe to me?

WB: 行啊 我的配方就是必须我亲自做 不能请
xíng a wǒ de pèifāng jiùshì bìxū wǒ qīnzì zuò. bìnéng qǐng rén
Boleh. Resepnya adalah harus aku sendiri yang membuatnya, tidak boleh menyuruh orang lain
 Okay. But, I am the one who created it. No one can make it. (00:27:51-00:27:55)

I warned you, you can mock me, but don't ever mock my mom!

XL2: 你有病, 你妈也有病

nǐ yǒu bìng, nǐ mā yěyǒu bìng

Kau gila, begitu juga ibumu.

You are crazy! So is your mother!

(01:22:12-01:22:22)

WB explained that the recipe for his pancake business had to be himself who made it and he did not want to give or sell his recipe to XL or to anyone else. So that WB's speech fulfils the criteria of the generosity maxims violation. After XL told WB that his business can be successful and opened many branches all over the country. WB certainly did not want anyone else as his competitors of the business so that WB did not want to give his pancake recipe to anyone. Thus, WB's speech can certainly have a function to "explain". Moreover, based on the type of Searle's illocutionary acts, WB's speech is included in the category of "explaining" function and it is the part of assertive illocutionary acts.

3.3. Expressive Illocutionary Acts

Expressive illocutionary acts are found 10 violations. Based on the analysis results, each of them is included into 3 sub-classifications of the expressive illocutionary acts function. The following below are the description of each function.

3.3.1. Criticize/Mocking

Context: After finding the location tracking device in WB's bag. XL did not believe everything what WB had said before. XL expressed his anger.

XL1: 那就是你们全家都有病

nà jiùshì nǐmen quánjiā dōu yǒu bìng

Seluruh keluargamu adalah orang gila

Your whole family is crazy!

WB1: 警告你, 说我可以 别说我吗

jǐnggào nǐ, shuō wǒ kěyǐ bié shuō wǒ ma

Kuperingatkan, kau boleh mengataiku, tapi jangan mengatai ibuku.

Based on the meaning of XL1 and XL2 speech, both of them belong to the types of speech that bad-mouth/criticize the WB as an interlocutor. It is included into the category of speech that violates the maxim of **compliment**. XL uses 有病 'yǒu bìng' (crazy/sick) which refers to WB and his family. XL humiliated/insulted WB and his family. XL's speech contradicts to the compliment maxim concept of Leech. WB intends to the speaker for speaking in good, polite language, and give as much compliment as possible to the interlocutor. Based on the concept of Searle's illocutionary act types, both of XL's utterances have the function of 'making fun of' which is a part of the illocutionary act types namely expressive illocutionary acts. The mocking function is used to express XL's anger after XL finds out that WB is carrying a location tracking device. XL considers WB to have collaborated with GB from the beginning and in deliberately put a location tracking device so that GB can be continuously know where XL is.

3.3.2. Blaming

Context: When XL told WB to sneak into GB's room to get GB's passport, it turned out that GB already knew about XL's location from WB's post on Weibo and it was tagged to XL's account so that GB could find out his position.

XL: 就是因为你刚才发了那条该死的微博他才跟上我的 你不觉得应该补偿一下么 .

jiùshì yīnwèi nǐ gāngcái fāle nà tiáo gāisǐ de wéi bó tā cái gēn shàng wǒ de nǐ bù juéde yīnggāi bǔcháng yīxià me.

Dan ini juga akibat dari postingan weibo sialanmu yang membuat dia bisa mengikutiku. Tidakkah kau pikir itu harus ada konsekuensinya?

It also the effect because of your d*mn Weibo post that makes him to follow me. Didn't you think that would be induced the consequences? (00:27:56-00:28:01).

The speech aims to assign a blame to the interlocutor which means that XL has violated the maxims of **generosity**. By blaming the interlocutor, XL does not give an advantage to the interlocutor; in contrast, he gives a disadvantage by placing the interlocutor in the wrong position. It contradicts the concept of Leech's generosity maxim which recommends the speaker give advantages to interlocutor. Furthermore, if XL's speech connects to Searle's illocutionary acts function, it is certain that the speech has a **blame** function included one of the sub-functions of expressive illocutionary acts. In sum, the 'blame' function in the WB's action is at the time of WB uploaded photos then the location being tracked on the Weibo account also tagged it on the XL account was considered as a wrong action as a result GB know where XL is.

3.3.3. Accusing

Context: While driving a car with WB, XL still felt frustrated because he thought that WB was the one who caused to get lost and trap by some gangsters even though he eventually escaped.

WB : 你甩我才是故意的

Nǐ shuāi wǒ cái shì gùyì de

Kok kamu menyinggalkan aku?

Why did you leave me?

XL : 你不是带错路就是删我图，你是不是故意的

Nǐ bùshì dài cuò lù jiùshì shān wǒ tú, nǐ shì bùshì gùyì de.

Kamu salah mengambil jalan dan menghapus petanya, kamu melakukannya dengan sengaja kan?

You passed to the wrong path and removed the map. You did that on purpose, right?

The speech indicates that XL directly accuses WB. The XL speech fulfils the criteria that violates the maxims of "generosity". Without any evidence and prior confirmation, XL immediately said that WB has done a mistake. It is due to the speech of them that XL accused WB of removing the map from the application and deliberately taking the wrong path. This action indicates that there has been a violation process to the maxim of Leech's policies. In brief, XL's speech is identified as 'accusations'. If we look at it based on the

type of Searle's illocutionary acts function, it is clear that it has a sub-function of expressive illocutionary acts namely accusing function.

3.4. Commissive Illocutionary Acts

A form of speech that fulfils the category of the politeness principle violation also is included in the commissive type of illocutionary acts is found in 5 data. After analysing the five data, they are classified into 2 sub-function types of commissive illocutionary acts. Those are:

3.4.1. Threatening

Context: When XL will go to Thailand, XL is in the office in anger because the information about where LZ is provided by his Secretary (SK) is not detailed.

XL1: 你希望我在泰国街头流浪吗

nǐ xīwàng wǒ zài Tàiguó jiētóu liúlàng ma

Kau ingin aku tersesat di Thailand?

Do you want me to get lost in Thailand?

SK1: 特别不希望 我一会儿就把地址地图发给你

tèbié bù xīwàng. wǒ yīhuì'er jiù bǎ dìzhǐ dìtú fā gěi nǐ

Tentu tidak menginginkannya. Aku akan segera mengirimkan pada anda peta lokasinya!

Of course not. I'll send you a map of the location immediately!

XL2:

你今天不把他在哪座山哪个庙，拜哪菩萨敲哪只木鱼给我查清楚 我就把你拉黑懂吗

nǐ jīntiān bù bǎ tā zài nǎ zuò shān nǎge miào bài nǎ púsà qiāo nǎ zhǐ mùyú gěi wǒ chá qīngchú wǒ jiù bǎ nǐ la hēi dǒng ma

Jika kau hari ini tidak bisa dengan jelas mengatakan padaku dia ada di gunung dan kuil apa, di patung Budha yang mana dan tongkat yang mana, kau tidak akan pernah bisa lagi bekerja di industri ini, paham?

If today you can't tell me clearly what mountain and temple, which Buddha statues and which sticks he is now. You will never work in this industry again, understand??

(00:05:08-00:05:17)

Based on the indicator table of the violation function of the Leech politeness principle, a 'threat' is a form of speech that is included in a violation indicator of the generosity maxim. This indicator is also found in XL2's speech especially in the section of the speech "If today you can't tell me clearly where he is. ..., You will never work in this industry again, understand?". In the speech is clearly that XL threatens to SK so that XL2's speech was a form of speech that violates the maxims of "generosity". XL2's speech function is compatible with a function of commissive illocutionary acts namely the **threatening** function which is the situation of SK that is unable to provide the information what XL needs in detail, XL will terminate her job.

3.4.2. Offering

Context: XL offered to WB that he would still accompany him to complete his wish-list in Thailand, with some terms that WB will show a picture of the temple where LZ is.

WB: 我们又不是朋友 我为什么要帮你

wǒmen yòu bùshì péngyǒu wǒ wèishéme yào bāng nǐ.

Kita bahkan bukan teman, kenapa aku harus membantumu.

We are not even friends. Why should I help you?

XL: 你看你身上没有钱，又不会说英文。你一个人怎么完成清单呢？

nǐ kàn nǐ shēnshang méiyǒu qián, yòu bù huì shuō yīngwén. nǐ yīgè rén zěnme wánchéng qīngdān ne?

Kamu tidak punya uang, dan bahkan tidak bisa bicara bahasa Inggris. Bagaimana bisa kamu menyelesaikan daftarnya sendiri?

You have no money and can't even speak English. How can you complete the list by yourself?

(00:38:48-00:38:56)

XL wants to help WB because XL knows that WB does not have money and his English skills are not good so XL wants to take advantage of WB's condition to fulfil his wish that is to get information about the temple location where LZ is. Thus, XL's speech violates the maxim of 'generosity' because it has the motivation to take advantage of the weakness situations of WB. This is in accordance with the function indicator table of Leech politeness principle violation. Furthermore, based on the type of Searle's illocutionary acts function,

XL's utterances have a function to **offer something**. Even though XL's utterances have certain purposes and conditions, the purpose of XL utterance is to offer something to WB speaker.

3.5. Directive Illocutionary Acts

Directive illocutionary acts has a purpose to give effect to the interlocutor to do something. In this study, there are 7 data were found as types of directive illocutionary acts and classified into 2 sub-functions of directive illocutionary acts. The descriptions of the two function types are as follows.

3.5.1. The Function of Prompting

Context: The speech occurs between XL and his wife (IXL) via phone while IXL is on the train. IXL said that she will immediately take care of their divorce proceedings. IXL asked XL to come to court on time the day after tomorrow.

XL: 可是我现在真的在泰国

kěshì wǒ xiànzài zhēn de zài tàiguó.

Tapi aku sekarang benar-benar sedang di Thailand.

But I am really in Thailand right now.

IXL: 我不管你在那 后天早上十点 请你准时到

wǒ bùguǎn nǐ zài nà, hòutiān zǎoshang shí diǎn qǐng nǐ zhǔnshí dào.

Aku tidak peduli kau ada dimana. Pokoknya lusa pukul 10 pagi, datang dengan tepat waktu.

I don't care where you are right now. The point is come on time at 10 AM in the day after tomorrow. (00:36:31-00:36:37).

IXL shows that she does not care about XL's existence even though XL has said his presence in Thailand. IXL just wants XL to come to court. The aspect of "ignorance" indicates that IXL's speech violates the maxim of "sympathy". IXL's ignorance in contrast to the concept of sympathy maxim. IXL's ignorance indicates that she persists XL to come to court on time. Therefore, the IXL speech form has a function to **prompt** in accordance with the sub-function criteria for directive illocutionary acts.

3.5.2. The Function of Requesting

Context: An argument occurs in the hotel room. When WB is hungry, he asks XL to go eating with him because XL can speak English. However, XL rejects his request even though WB argues that he cannot order because he cannot speak English.

WB1 : 我没有钱

wǒ méiyǒu qián.

Aku tidak punya uang.

I have no money.

XL1 : 随便拿

suíbiàn ná.

Ambilah sesukamu (sambil memberikan dompetnya).

Order everything you want! (*while giving his wallet*)

WB2 : 我不会英语 点不了菜

wǒ bù huì yīngyǔ diǎn bùliǎo cài

Aku tidak bisa bahasa Inggris, jadi tidak bisa pesan makanan.

I cannot order because I cannot speak in English.

(00:19:57-00:20:05).

WB2's speech is a violation of **generosity** maxim because WB tries to get advantage for himself in result XL will go out to eat with him. Based on the speech "beg/request"; in result, XL accompany WB to eat. XL keeps company with WB surely profitable. Apart from not having money, WB's English proficiency is also not good so that XL participation is very much needed by WB then WB's needs will be fulfilled. WB are more concerned with his own needs and ignoring XL. Based on the type of illocutionary acts function of Searle, WB2's utterances speech is a type of directive illocutionary acts that has the function of **requesting**. Specifically, WB asked XL's willingness to go eating with him then WB reasoned that he did not have money and could not speak English so that he needed XL.

4. CONCLUSION

The form and type of speech have a very close relationship with the speech situation because the form and type of speech are used as a result of calculating the

adjustment to the speech situation. Therefore, the speech situation has a role in the formation of speech types which results in the emergence of the types and functions of the speech. The same speech form does not guarantee to have the same function when the speech is used in different speech situations.

The speech situation can be a factor that causes disobedience to the use of speech type as a form of politeness principle violation. The occurrence of violations is due to the emergence of a desire among the speech partners to achieve their respective goals. So that violation of the politeness principle is more used as a strategy because the interlocutor violation to be a party that is more disadvantaged. The function of speech forms which is identified as a violation of the politeness principle can be studied through the concept of Searle's illocutionary acts type. The function of each speech has suitability with the concept of several types of illocutionary speech.

REFERENCES

- [1] Waliya, *Bahasa Indonesia dalam Perbincangan*. Jakarta: IKIP Muhammadiyah Jakarta Press, 1996.
- [2] O. U. Effendy. *Ilmu Komunikasi Teori dan Praktek*. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya, 1989.
- [3] Halliday, M.A.K, & R. Hasan. *Language. Context, and Text: Aspect of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University, 1989.
- [4] N. E. Rusminto, *Analisis Wacana Sebuah Kajian Teoretis dan Praktis*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2015.
- [5] M. Bronislaw, "Language in Social Context" in *O' Grady, William and Archibald John. eds. Contemporary Linguistic Analysis: An Introduction*. Canada. Pearson Education, 2004.
- [6] B. Smith, *John Searle: From Speech Acts to Social Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. [E-book] Doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511613999.001
- [7] J. E. Acheoah, "The Pragma-crafting Theory: A Proposed Theoretical Framework for Pragmatic Analysis," *International Journal of English and Literature*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 21-32, 2015.
- [8] G. Leech, *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia, 2015.

- [9] J. E. Acheoah, "The Illocutionary Frames Principle (IFP) and the Austinian Postulations: A Clause-structure Investigative Discourse," *Global Journal of Human- Social Science, Linguistics and Psychology*, vol. 13, no. 13, pp. 21-29, 2014.
- [10] Rustono, *Pokok-pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: CV IKIP Semarang Press, 1999.
- [11] K. Rahardi, *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga, 2005.
- [12] J. E. Acheoah, "Searle's Speech Act Theory: An Integrative Appraisal," *American Research Journals*, vol. 3, pp. 13, 2017.
- [13] Q. A'ini, "Fungsi Pelanggaran Maksim Prinsip Kesantunan pada Komentar Berita Online di Fanspage Facebook Merdeka.com," *Prasasti: Journal Linguistics*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 200-210, 2018.
- [14] Y. Yusri, "Pelanggaran Kesopanan Berbahasa dalam Komunikasi Politik pada Pemilihan Gubernur Sulawesi Selatan 2013," *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 26-39, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v5i1.26-39>
- [15] I. Egner, "Intercultural Aspects of the Speech Act of Promising: Western and African Practice," *Intercultural Pragmatics*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 443-464, 2006.
- [16] N. M. Zayed, "Jordanian EFL Teachers and Students Practice of Speech Acts in the Classroom," *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 1-10, 2014.
- [17] S. F. Altikriti, "Speech Act Analysis to Short Stories," *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 1374-1384, 2011.
- [18] T. Z. Ariff, "Speech Act of Promising Among Jordanian," *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 3, no. 13, pp. 248-266, 2013.
- [19] L. T. Budiasih, Andayani, & M. Rohmadi, "Illocution on Speech Acts of Foreign Students in Indonesian Learning," *Journal of Linguistics and Education*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 41-48, 2016.
- [20] B. K. Purwo, *Pragmatik dan Pengajaran Bahasa: Menyibak Kurikulum 1984*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1990.
- [21] A. Chaer, *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2010.
- [22] I. D. P. Wijana, & M. Rohmadi, *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik: Kajian Teori dan Analisis*. Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka, 2009.
- [23] J. R. Searle, *SPEECH ACTS: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: University Press, 1985. [E-book] Available: https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=t3_WhfknvF0C&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Searle,+John+R.+1985.+SPEECH+ACTS:+An+Essay+in+the+Philosophy+of+Language.+Cambridge:+University+Press+pdf&ots=0TnQcWQ4T7&sig=wlAs6DMRZdAzu8QSUx0Lwhiun54&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
- [24] A. Novianti, *Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Bahasa Melayu Dialek Sambas*. Semarang: Master Program in Linguistics Diponegoro University, 2008. http://eprints.undip.ac.id/34123/1/THESIS_EVI_NOVIANTI.pdf
- [25] I. Sutanto, "Analysis of Politeness Strategy and Maxim Violation in "Scream" Movie," *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 19-28, 2019.
- [26] A. Gunarwan, *Kesantunan Negatif di Kalangan Dwibahasawan Indonesia-Jawa di Jakarta: Kajian Sosiopragmatik (PELLBA 7)*. Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa Unika Atma Jaya, 1994.