

**DIRECTIVE ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS IN RELATION TO  
POLITENESS STRATEGY IN THE HISTORICAL MOVIE *THE  
KING'S SPEECH***

**A THESIS**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistics in  
English Department Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University**

Submitted by:  
GARNIS TRISNAWATI  
NIM: A2B007056

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY

SEMARANG

2011

**PRONOUNCEMENT**

The writer honestly confirms that she compiles this thesis entitled 'Directive Illocutionary Acts and Politeness Strategy (A case study on *The King's Speech*)' by herself and without taking any result from other research in S-1, S-2, S-3, and in diploma degree of any university. The writer ascertains also that she does not quote any material from other publications or someone's paper except from the references mentioned.

# **APPROVAL**

Approved by  
Advisor,

Drs. Mualimin. Dip.Tesl.M.Hum  
NIP 19611110 198710 1001

## **VALIDATION**

Approved by  
Strata 1 Thesis Examination Committee  
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University  
On 29 July 2011

## **MOTTO AND DEDICATION**

Without continual growth and progress,  
such words as improvement, achievement,  
and success have no meaning.

- Benjamin Franklin -

This paper is dedicated to  
My beloved family, my future husband and  
to everyone who helped me accomplish this paper.  
“Thank you very much for supporting me”

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Foremost, all praises to God Almighty, who has given strength and true spirit so this thesis comes to completion. On this occasion, the writer would like to thank all people who have helped and inspired her in finishing this thesis.

This thesis reflects the contributions of several people who have been involved in the writer's long process to finish her thesis. The writer especially would like to express her sincere gratitude to the following helpful people.

1. Dr. *Agus Maladi Irianto*, MA., Dean of the faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
2. Dr. *Ratna Asmarani*, M.Ed., M.Hum., Head of the English Department, the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
3. Dra. *Deli Nirmala*, M.Hum., Head of Linguistics Section of the Faculty of Humanities who also has shared her knowledge with the writer.
4. Drs. *Mualimin*. Dip.Tesl.M.Hum., the writer's advisor, for his support, correction, patience, motivation, enthusiasm and immense knowledge. His guidance helped her in all the time of research and writing of this thesis.
5. Dr. *Nurhayati* M.Hum, the writer's academic supervisor, who always gives support to her.
6. All lecturers and academic officers in the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University for their contribution.
7. Her beloved parents (her father, Markum and her mother, Sri Dwi Sulistyowati) who have always given her support encouragement, advice and prayer. ("You are both the best teachers in my life").
8. Her best friends, Ike and Indri for the truly good friendship until now (and she hopes forever), and for the help, support, prayer as well as their time and energy in sharing so much knowledge and information with her.
9. Her beloved future husband, Iwan Budi Winaryoko for the true love and spirit in supporting her.
10. All friends in the English Department 2007, the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University for studying and learning English together, and for their supports.
11. All people who always stay in her heart that can not be mentioned one by one for the contributions and assistances.

The writer realizes that this thesis is still far from perfect. She will be glad to receive criticism and suggestion to make this thesis better. She asks apology to all people to whom she has made mistakes during the study. Finally, the writer expects that this thesis is useful to the writer and everyone who is interested in linguistic study.

Semarang, July 2011

The writer

## ABSTRAK

Dalam berkomunikasi khususnya pada saat membuat tuturan direktif, penutur menggunakan cara atau strategi tertentu agar petutur melakukan sesuatu sesuai dengan keinginan penutur. Dalam skripsi ini, penulis tertarik untuk menganalisis tindak ilokusi direktif dengan strategi dan prinsip kesantunan yang digunakan oleh penutur dalam dialog film *The King's Speech* karya David Seidler. Hal yang menjadi fokus dalam skripsi ini adalah tindak tutur apa sajakah yang dihasilkan oleh penutur dalam film ini dan bagaimana prinsip serta strategi kesantunan dapat mempengaruhi alasan mengapa penutur menggunakan tindak ilokusi direktif tertentu. Untuk mengetahui hal ini, penulis menggunakan teori tindak tutur dan kesantunan.

Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah metode deskriptif kualitatif. Data yang digunakan berupa ujaran atau kalimat yang dianggap mengandung tindak ilokusi direktif dari semua tokoh yang berperan dalam film ini. Metode pengambilan sampel menggunakan *purposive sampling* dan metode simak. Dalam menganalisis data yang ada, penulis menggunakan teori Austin, Searle, Leech, Grice, Vanderveken, dan Brown and Levinson.

Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa terdapat lima puluh satu ujaran yang mengandung tindak ilokusi direktif, dua puluh dua diantaranya dituturkan secara langsung dan dua puluh sembilan lainnya dituturkan secara tidak langsung. Selain itu, terdapat empat puluh delapan tindak ilokusi direktif yang dituturkan secara harfiah dan tiga lainnya dituturkan secara tidak harfiah. Berdasarkan kesantunan, dua puluh tiga tindak ilokusi direktif dilakukan secara terus terang dan selebihnya dilakukan secara tidak terus terang.

Secara keseluruhan, dapat disimpulkan bahwa penutur dalam dialog film *The King's Speech* lebih cenderung menggunakan tindak ilokusi direktif secara tidak langsung dengan makna harfiah dan dengan cara tidak terus terang.

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

### A. Background of the Study

Language is very important in communication and speech acts are act of communication. By doing speech acts, speaker tries to convey intention and purpose of the communication by the hope that it is understandable by the hearer. Speech acts are not just acts such as making a word, but also having more meaning behind the words uttered, as suggested by Austin's theory in *How to Do Things with Words*. There is an interesting phenomenon to observe, i.e. the speaker's decision in choosing directive illocutionary acts. The chosen

utterances of directive illocutionary acts show the speaker's way in fulfilling conversational principle and in using strategy in running communicative interaction with the hearer so that the hearer does the speaker's intention. The directive illocutionary acts are speech acts uttered by the speaker to get the hearer to do something. It includes commands, orders, requests, and suggestions (Yule, 1996:54).

Previously, there are several researches about directive illocutionary acts that discuss mainly the classification of directive illocutionary acts. Based on this background, the writer is interested not only in analyzing and elaborating particularly the classification of directive illocutionary acts but also in relating to the politeness principle and strategy used by the speaker in making directive illocutionary acts in the interaction of the dialogue in the movie.

For the substance of analysis, the writer decides to analyze directive illocutionary acts in the movie *The King's Speech*. The writer's reason for choosing this movie to be analyzed is that the film is a historical drama film based on a true story from the book written by David Seidler, *The King's Speech* in which the writer expects that the dialogues in the movie contain dialogues that exist in real life, even though the writer knows that the movie dialogue is fictional dialogue. *The King's Speech* is a film about the story of King George VI of Britain. At the start of World War II around 1939, Albert who finally became the King George VI was afflicted with a speech stammer since the age of five. He got difficult to speak to his nation. Owing to the royal condition that pressed Albert, he could not speak fluently. Queen Elizabeth sought Lionel Logue, an Australian speech therapist who could help Albert to fight his stammer.

In this research, the writer discusses the classification of directive illocutionary acts in relation to politeness principle and strategy used by the speaker in the movie. The transcription of the dialogues in *The King's Speech movie* is used as the data. These data were analyzed by using speech acts theory of Austin (1967), Searle (1969), theory of Grice (1975), theory of Leech (1983), and theory of Brown and Levinson (1987/1978).

## B. Research Question

The research questions of this study are: (1) what kinds of directive illocutionary acts of the dialogues in *The King's Speech* are used by the speaker seen from the aspect of (i) explicit or implicit performative, (ii) direct or indirect directive illocutionary acts, (iii) literal or nonliteral directive illocutionary acts, (iv) function of directive illocutionary acts, and (v) the speaker's mood in making directive illocutionary acts; (2) How is the use of politeness principle and strategy by the speaker in making directive illocutionary acts.

## C. Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this research are:

1. Elaborating the classification of directive illocutionary acts of the dialogues in *The King's Speech* into type, mood, and function of directive illocutionary acts used by the speaker to the hearer in this movie.
2. Analyzing the politeness principle and strategy used by the speaker in uttering directive illocutionary acts.

## D. Previous Study

The previous study on this research is "Directive Illocutionary Acts in the Cartoon Movie *Finding Nemo*" by Elvira Novita (2008) which is focused on classification of directive illocutionary acts and component of illocutionary forces in cartoon movie *Finding Nemo*.

## E. Writing Organization

This paper falls into five following chapters:

### **Chapter I Introduction**

This chapter includes background of the study, research question, purposes of the study, previous study and writing organization.

### **Chapter II Literary Review**

This chapter contains the speech acts and the politeness theory.

### **Chapter III Research Method**

This chapter includes type of research method, source of the data, method of collecting data, population and sample and method of analyzing data.

### **Chapter IV Data Analysis**

This chapter includes the data analysis.

### **Chapter V Conclusion**

This chapter consists of conclusion of the whole discussion and suggestion for the further study.



## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERARY REVIEW**

#### **A. Speech Acts**

##### **1. Utterance**

In Austin's book *How to Do Things with Words* (1967:47), utterance is divided into two categories, i.e. constative and performative.

##### **1. Constative Utterance**

The constative is an act of saying something (Austin, 1967:132). It can be defined as just stating or reporting an affair. Constative utterances can be categorized as true or false utterances. For example:

###### *1) John is running.*

The utterance above is made based on the fact that the speaker knew that *John is running*. Because of that affair, in which John is running, the speaker can make that statement. Furthermore, the speaker's statement above, which is based on the fact that John is running, can be confirmed as a true utterance.

##### **2. Performative Utterance**

The performative is not just an act of saying something but also an act of doing something. It can be characterized based on felicity or infelicity (Austin, 1967:132). For example, if the speaker says:

###### *2) I promise to come.*

The utterance of saying promise above is not just an act of saying statement. It demands the speaker to do a certain act in the future.

#### **2. Speech Acts**

In general, speech acts are acts of communication. Speech acts, according to Austin, are not only saying something, but also 'doing' something.

*Speech act is an action such as making a statement, giving orders, asking questions, making appointments, etc., ..., this action is generally made possible by and conducted in accordance with certain rules for the use of linguistic elements (Searle, 1969:16).*

Speech acts can occur in certain circumstance, called speech event.

#### **3. Types of Speech Acts Based on Austin's Theory**

In *How to Do Things with Words* (1967:101), Austin argued that there are three types of speech acts i.e. locution, illocution, and perlocution.

##### **1. Locutionary Act**

Locution is an act of speaking that reveals something or expresses something. Austin (1967:99) said that locutionary act is "performance of an act of saying something". It is the same as an act of saying certain things accompanied with certain sense and reference.

##### **2. Illocutionary Act**

Illocution is an act which is performed by saying something e.g. warning and asking. Austin (1967:99) stated that illocutionary act is "performance of an act in saying something".

##### **3. Perlocutionary Act**

Perlocution is an act which is done by saying something, to make others believe in something by urging the others either to do something or to influence others. Austin

(1967:121) stated that perlocutionary act is “the achieving of certain effects by saying something”.

To distinguish those types of speech acts, here are the examples that are shown by Austin clearly:

3) *Shoot her!*

Locutionary act:

He said to me “Shoot her!” meaning by ‘shoot’ shoot and referring by ‘her’ to her.

Illocutionary act:

He urged (or advised, ordered, &c.) me to shoot her.

Perlocutionary act:

He persuade me to shoot her.

(Austin, 1967:101).

#### 4. Kinds of Illocutionary Acts

Searle (1976) in Levinson (1983:240) stated that there are five types of illocutionary acts, i.e. representatives, directives, commissive, expressive, and declaratives. The writer just focuses on the directive illocutionary acts. Directive illocutionary acts are speech acts used by speaker in order to get the hearer to do something (Levinson, 1983:240).

1)

2)

3)

#### 5. Kinds of Speech Acts Based on Several Aspects of Speech Acts

##### 1. Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Based on the basic structure, sentences or utterances can be identified as direct utterances and indirect utterances (Yule, 1996:54). Direct speech acts are the speech acts that perform their function in a direct way, whereas, indirect speech acts are the acts accomplished by using language in indirect ways.

For example:

1)

2)

3)

4) *Move your feet!* (Direct speech act).

5) *It's very hot in here.* (The speaker has intention to make the addressee open the window, so it is called as indirect speech act).

##### 2. Explicit and Implicit Performative Utterance

Speech acts may be explicit or implicit. According to Austin (1967:64), explicit performative can be characterized by verbs that explicitly state the action. On the other hand, implicit performatives need an expansion to make them explicit. To make it explicit, it is important to know something about the situation, mood, tone of voice, adverbs and adverbial phrases, connecting particles, gesture, etc.

The following sentences are some examples of explicit and implicit speech acts:

1)

- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)

6) *I order you to clean the table.* (Explicit performative)

7) *Clean the table!* (It is called as implicit performative because there is no certain addressee the speaker chooses and no information stated that the speaker give an order to the addressee)

### 3. Literal and Nonliteral Speech Acts

Wijana (1996:33) maintained that literal speech acts are acts of speech in which the intention is same as the meaning of the structures that construct the utterance. In contrast, nonliteral speech acts have the intention which is different from the meaning of the structures which construct it. For further explanation, there are the examples of literal and non literal speech acts:

- 4)
- 5)
- 6)
- 7)

8) *The voice of that singer is really good.* (Literal speech act)

9) *Your voice is so sweet!*(It's better not to sing) (Nonliteral speech act)

The direct and indirect speech acts can be integrated with literal and nonliteral speech acts as the following categorization: 1.) direct literal speech acts, 2.) indirect literal speech acts, 3.) direct non literal speech acts, and 4.) indirect nonliteral speech acts. It can be clearer as the description by the following example:

10) *Open your mouth!* (Direct literal speech act; in fact, the speaker really wants the hearer to open his mouth).

11) *The floor is very dirty.* (Indirect literal speech act; the speaker does not make a statement that the floor is dirty, but in fact, he asks his maid to clean it).

12) *You can make the radio's volume louder, so that I can study tonight.* (Direct nonliteral speech act; the speaker allows the hearer to do this act, but in fact the speaker has the inverse intention).

13) *The floor is very clean.* (Indirect nonliteral speech act; the speaker does not intend to make a statement that the floor is very clean, but the opposite meaning that the floor is very dirty. More over, by saying that, the speaker wants the hearer to clean that floor.

### 6. Moods of Speech Acts

Based on the moods, speech acts are divided into three types i.e. declarative, interrogative, and imperative (Yule, 1996:54). For example:

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)

- 4)
- 5)
- 6)
- 7)
- 8)
- 9)
- 10)
- 11)
- 12)
- 13)

14) *Michael leans against the wall and tries to sleep.* (Declarative)

15) *Can I ask a question?* (Interrogative)

16) *Get your feet off my dash!* (Imperative)

## **7. Functions of Directive Illocutionary Acts**

The illocutionary point of directive illocutionary acts, according to Vanderveken (1990: 105), consists of making efforts to get the hearer to do the speaker's intention. There are functions of directive speech acts such as ordering, requesting, suggesting, and so forth. Cruse in *Meaning in Language* (2000:342) suggested that there are several functions of Directives, i.e. ordering, commanding, requesting, begging, beseeching, advising, warning, recommending, asking, and so forth.

There are several other functions of directive speech acts, i.e. inviting, forbidding, allowing, permitting, encouraging, soliciting, insisting, etc.

### **B. Politeness**

#### **1. Context**

Context can be defined as a background of knowledge which is assumed not only to be owned and agreed by the speaker and the hearer, but also should be supported by the hearer's interpretation toward the speaker's intention in the certain utterance of the speaker (Tarigan, 1986:35).

#### **2. Politeness**

Yule (1996:60) said that "politeness, in an interaction, can then be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face." Face can be defined as the public self-image of a person.

#### **3. Cooperative Principle**

Cooperative principle is usually applied in conversation in order to make a cooperative conversation. To analyze the strategy used by the speaker, Grice (1975) mentioned four maxims of cooperative principle, i.e. maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner (Grice in Yule, 1996:37).

##### **1. Maxim of Quantity**

In this maxim, the speaker is expected to give adequate information as much as is required. If the given information contains more than is required, it is called as the violation of this maxim.

##### **2. Maxim of Quality**

In uttering something, the speaker is insisted to say the fact based on the real situation which happened. The fact must be supported by the adequate evidence.

### 3. Maxim of Relevance

Both the speaker and the hearer are expected to give the relevant contribution about something which is uttered.

### 4. Maxim of Manner

The speaker must utter something directly, clearly, and unambiguously.

### 4. Politeness Principle

Leech (1983:132) stated that politeness principle consists of six maxims, i.e. tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. For this analysis, the writer just includes three kinds of principle, i.e.:

#### 1. Tact Maxim

Minimizing the disadvantage and maximizing the advantage of the hearer are expected to be obeyed in this maxim (Leech, 1983:132). It is expressed in impositive and commissive illocution. It can be described in the following example:

17) A: *Let me carry those cases for you.*

The hearer should refuse this offer to obey the tact maxim and to be regarded as a polite response. In another case, sometimes people violate this maxim by saying yes and they do not care if it is regarded as an impoliteness.

#### 2. Generosity Maxim

Making the speaker's advantage as less as possible and making the speaker's disadvantage as much as possible are the principle of this maxim which is expressed in impositive and commissive illocution (Leech, 1983:132). For example:

- 4)
- 5)
- 6)
- 7)
- 8)
- 9)
- 10)
- 11)
- 12)
- 13)
- 14)
- 15)
- 16)
- 17)

18) *You can lend me your car.* (impolite)

19) *I can lend you my car.* (polite)

20) *You must come and dinner with us.* (polite)

21) *We must come and have dinner with you.* (impolite)

Examples (19) and (20) are polite because they give more priority the hearer's advantage and imply the disadvantage of the speaker. Examples (18) and (21) contain condition in which scale of advantage that is reflected is on the contrary with examples (19) and (20).

### 3. Agreement Maxim

It can be expressed in assertive illocution in which we have to make an effort the minimal disagreement and maximal agreement with the other people (Leech, 1983:132). For

instance:

22) A: A referendum will satisfy everybody. B: Yes, definitely.

## 5. Power, Distance, and Rank of Imposition

As suggested by Brown and Levinson, there are three sociological factors that are crucial in determining the level of politeness that the speaker will use to the hearer, i.e. the relative power of the hearer over the speaker, the social distance between the speaker and the hearer, and the ranking of imposition involved in doing the face-threatening-act (1987/1978:80). The following examples will describe the notion of relative power, social distance, and the ranking of imposition:

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)
- 6)
- 7)
- 8)
- 9)
- 10)
- 11)
- 12)
- 13)
- 14)
- 15)
- 16)
- 17)
- 18)
- 19)
- 20)
- 21)
- 22)

23) *Excuse me sir, would it be all right if I smoke?*

24) Mind if I smoke?

The example (23) above maybe said by the employee to his boss, and in contrast for example (24); it maybe said by the boss to the employee.

25) *Excuse me, would you by any chance have the time?*

26) Got the time, mate?

The example (25) shows that the speaker and the hearer were distant. On the other hand, the example (26) shows that the speaker and the hearer were close or known each other.

27) *Look, I'm terribly sorry to bother you but would there be any chance of your lending me just enough money to get a railway ticket to get home? I must have dropped my purse and I just don't know what to do.*

28) Hey, got change for a quarter?

Both examples maybe said by the frustrated traveler, but it can be seen in the example (28) that the speaker who says that utterance considers that FTA (face-threatening-act) is much more serious than the example (27) is.

## 6. Politeness Strategy

In common description of the scheme of politeness strategy, it can be described as the following explanation as suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987/1978:60):

The choice of politeness strategy based on the risk of face loss can be divided into saying something or not. Saying something is divided into doing the FSA (face-saving-act) or not. Doing the FSA is included of on and off record. On record can be done with or without redressive action, in which with redressive action contains positive and negative politeness.

### 1. Bald on record

Bald on record as suggested by Yule (196:63) is the most direct approach; in other words, the hearer is asked for something directly. There are several reasons why people choose this way in the interaction with the others.

*It is simply because...those where the face threat is not minimized, where face is ignored or is irrelevant; and those where in doing the FTA baldly on record, the speaker minimizes face threats by implication (Brown and Levinson, 1987/1978:95).*

For example:

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)
- 6)
- 7)
- 8)
- 9)
- 10)
- 11)
- 12)
- 13)
- 14)
- 15)
- 16)
- 17)
- 18)
- 19)
- 20)
- 21)
- 22)
- 23)
- 24)
- 25)
- 26)
- 27)
- 28)



29) *Lend me your pen.*

## 2. Positive politeness

“A positive politeness strategy leads the requester to appeal to a common goal, and even friendship, via expressions.”(Yule, 1996:64) There are several positive politeness strategies, such as use in-group identity makers; be optimistic; include both speaker and hearer in the activity; give (or ask for reasons), and so forth (Brown and Levinson, 1987/1978: 103-129).

### 1. Use in-group Identity Markers

The speaker can use this strategy by using addressee form such as dear, honey, duke, guys, etc. For example:

30) *Bring me your dirty clothes to wash, honey / darling / Johnny.*

1.

### 2. Be Optimistic

For this strategy, the speaker assumes that the hearer wants to fulfill the speaker's wants and will help the speaker to obtain them. For example:

31) *You will lend me your money, won't you.*

### 3. Include both Speaker and Hearer in the Activity

The speaker can use an inclusive 'we' form, when the speaker really means 'you' and 'me'. In English, *let's* is an inclusive 'we'. For example:

32) *Let's have a cookie, then.*

### 4. Give (or Ask for Reasons)

This is a strategy in which the speaker gives reason as to why he wants what he wants. It can be for the speaker's advantage or the hearer's advantage.

29)

30)

31)

32)

33) *Why don't I help you with that suitcase.*

## 3. Negative Politeness

For negative politeness (Yule, 1996:64), “the most typical form used is a question containing a modal verb”, like the following example:

34) *Could you lend me a pen?*

Negative politeness includes several strategies, such as be conventionally indirect, question (hedge), be pessimistic, etc. (Brown and Levinson, 1987/1978: 132-210).

### 1. Be Conventionally Indirect

The speaker tends to get the hearer to do his intention by letting him to interpret the speaker's intention based on the conventionally indirectness of the directive illocutionary acts. For instance:

35) *Could you possibly close the window, please?*

### 2. Question, Hedge

This is a strategy that can be used by the speaker by including hedge. There is the example of the adverbial-clause hedges, which can be used by the speaker in making directive illocutionary acts, by using 'if', clause:

36) *Would you close the window, if you don't mind?*

### **3. Be Pessimistic**

This strategy gives redress the hearer' negative face by explicitly expressing doubt that the situation for the appropriateness of speaker's speech acts obtain.

37) *Perhaps you'd care to help me.*

### **4. Off Record**

Off record is a communicative act that is done by unclear speaker's communicative intention in order to give impression that he does not do FTA or to avoid the responsibility for doing it and letting the hearer decide how to interpret it (Brown and Levinson, 1987/1978:211).

Based on the theory of politeness, off record contains several strategies, such as give hints; give association clues; presuppose; overstate; use tautologies; be ironic; use rhetorical questions; over-generalize; and be incomplete, use ellipsis; etc. ( Brown and Levinson, 1987/1978: 213-227).

#### **1. Give Hints**

The speaker says something that is not relevant explicitly and lets the hearer to find the interpretation of the possible relevance. For example:

38) *It's cold here.* (Con conversationally implicates *shut the window*).

#### **2. Give Association Clues**

Speaker gives the clues that have the relation between the speaker's and the hearer's knowledge. For example:

39) *Oh God, I forget my pen again.*

That utterance conveys a request to borrow the hearer's pen. The speaker and the hearer mutually know that they both have an association between the speaker who forgets his pen and wants to borrow the hearer's pen.

#### **3. Presuppose**

40) *I washed the car again today.*

The speaker presupposes that he has done it before and therefore may implicate a protest. It forces the hearer to search for the relevance of the presupposed prior event.

#### **4. Overstate**

The speaker uses this strategy by saying more than is necessary.

41) *There were a million people in the Co-op tonight!*

#### **5. Use Tautologies**

This is a strategy that is used by uttering a tautology where the speaker encourages the hearer to look for an informative interpretation of non-informative utterance. For instance:

42) *War is war.*

#### **6. Be Ironic**

This strategy can be applied by saying the *opposite* of what the speaker means. For example:

43) *John is genius* (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row).

#### **7. Use Rhetorical Question**

The speaker uses this strategy by asking a question without hoping the answer. For instance:

44) *What can I say?* (Nothing, it's too bad).

#### **8. Over-Generalize**

The speaker uses this strategy by making the general rule of the utterance and letting the hearer decide whether the general rule applies to him or not. For instance:

45) *Mature people sometimes help do the dishes.*

**9. Be Incomplete, Use ellipsis**

In this strategy, the speaker makes his utterance toward the hearer incompletely.

46) *Oh sir, a headache...* (The speaker uses this strategy to ask the hearer for an aspirin).

## **CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD**

### **A. Type of Research Method**

Type of this research is descriptive qualitative method. This research elaborates the utterances assumed to contain directive illocutionary acts, objectively and factually not by using number but using explanation and description (Jauhari, 2010:49). The data forms are descriptive data written in script that is listed in the true-story movie *The King's Speech*.

### **B. Source of Data**

Based on Sutrisno Hadi, there are two types of data source. Firstly, the primary source which is obtained authentically by the researcher herself. Secondly, secondary source is used to support the primary data. To get the directive illocutionary acts of the utterances, the writer uses the primary data source and does not need to conduct interview or field observation. The data can be obtained from the original script of the movie downloaded from the internet and supported by the movie in DVD format.

### **C. Method of Collecting Data**

According to Sudaryanto (1993:133), the method of collecting data in this research is “*Metode Simak*” meaning that the researcher pays good attention to the use of language (on the true-story movie *The King’s Speech* among the speaker and the hearer). To conduct the method of collecting data, the writer uses several techniques. First, according to Jauhari (2010:135), the writer uses observation technique because the writer uses her sight sense to collect the utterances containing directive illocutionary acts by watching the movie in which before watching the movie, the writer reads carefully the original script, then the writer uses note taking technique for collecting the data.

For the next technique, the writer uses the technique of “*Simak Bebas Libat Cakap (SBLC)*” which is defined as the technique where the writer involves neither directly nor indirectly in making the dialogue which will be used as the data (Sudaryanto, 1993:134). The writer just becomes the observer of the conversations of the dialogue in the movie *The King’s Speech*. The writer also uses “*Teknik Catat*”, meaning that the writer involves directly and pays a good attention to the conversation in the process of searching and collecting accurate data, and the writer notes and writes all the data which has relation to the topic. The next step, the writer makes transcription from the chosen speaker’s utterances, called pragmatic transcription. The last step, the writer classifies and elaborates the obtained data based on the kinds of directive illocutionary acts and the politeness principle and strategy used by the speaker in issuing directive illocutionary acts toward the hearer.

Here are the several steps that the writer makes in collecting the data:

1. The writer watches the movie entitled “*The King’s Speech*” while reading the script many times in order to have a deep understanding of the story along with its context. The script is obtained from the internet. The function of watching process here is just as synchronization of the original dialogues in the script with the dialogues spoken by the characters in the film.
2. While identifying the data from the movie’s script, the writer is identifying the video.
3. Making a pragmatic transcription from the chosen speaker’s utterances.
4. Classifying the utterances according to the kinds of directive illocutionary acts and elaborating the speaker’s politeness principle and strategy which are used.
5. Preparing the data to be analyzed.

### **D. Population and Sampling**

The population of this analysis consists of all utterances existing in the movie *The King’s Speech*. For getting the sample, the writer uses a purposive sampling method. It is a kind of selection method where the samples are taken from the data containing criteria of showing variety of variables which is needed in this study (Kerlinger in Key, 1997). Based on that method, the writer just takes sample consisting of directive illocutionary acts.

## E. Method of Analyzing Data

In this research, the writer uses identity method, especially pragmatic identity method to analyze the data because the indicator device of this research is based on the reaction of the hearer as the effect of the utterances issued by the speaker (Sudaryanto, 1993:115).

There are several main steps consisting of several sub steps the writer uses to analyze the data:

1. The steps of analyzing the utterances to perform illocutionary acts:  
Choosing the kinds of utterance in the movie script *The King's Speech* and classifying the utterance based on their function by using Austin theory and finding the type of the utterance.
2. The steps of analyzing in order to elaborate the kinds of directive illocutionary acts:
  1. Classifying the utterances which have been categorized as utterances which are assumed to perform illocutionary act into the kinds of illocutionary act based on the Searle's theory.
  2. Classifying the chosen utterance which is categorized as directive illocutionary acts into literal or nonliteral directive illocutionary acts which are uttered directly or indirectly.
3. The steps of analyzing the politeness principle and strategy which are used by the speaker.
  1. Classifying the categorized directive illocutionary acts based on the politeness strategy used by the speaker by using Brown and Levinson's theory.
  2. Classifying the politeness principle that is used in the certain directive illocutionary acts by theory politeness principle of Leech. This process of classification is also supported with additional theory of Grice's cooperative principle.

The following steps are the general way the writer use to analyze the data:

1. Determining the form of utterances assumed to contain directive illocutionary acts by using performative analysis theory by Austin.
2. Describing the utterances containing directive illocutionary acts which are uttered either in the direct or indirect and literal or nonliteral type of speech acts.
3. Describing the mood and the function of directive illocutionary acts.
4. Elaborating the kind of politeness principle and strategy used by the speaker in uttering directive illocutionary acts.
5. Generalizing the forms of directive illocutionary acts in order to get the mood mostly used by the speaker and the chosen politeness principle and strategy found in the utterances of the true-story *The King's Speech*.

---

Semarang, July 2011

The writer

Garnis Trisnawati

First Member

Drs. Mualimin, Dip. Tesl.M.Hum  
NIP 19611110 198710 1001

Second Member

Dwi Wulandari, S.S., M.A.  
NIP 19761004 200112 2 001

Chair Person

Dra. Kusrahayuwati, M.A.  
NIP 19470209 197501 2 001