

## INFELICITOUS ILLOCUTIONS IN *HOW TO TRAIN YOUR DRAGON*

BY:

PUTU AYU YUNITA YASTINI

### Abstrak

*Studi deskriptif kualitatif ini membahas tentang ilokusi dalam naskah film yang berjudul How to Train Your Dragon beserta dengan ilokusi yang tidak berterima yang ditemukan di dalam naskah tersebut. Studi ini berawal dari pemahaman dasar pragmatic bahwa setiap ujaran memiliki maknanya tersendiri dan dalam menyampaikan ujaran dengan baik dan benar prasyarat yang dinamakan "felicity condition" haruslah dipenuhi oleh pembicara dan pendengar. Ada kalanya terdapat perbedaan antara "felicity condition" yang ditentukan dengan kenyataan saat ujaran disampaikan. Perbedaan ini yang umumnya terdapat pada ilokusi ini dapat dianalisis sebagai ilokusi yang tidak berterima.*

*Data yang diperoleh dari naskah film tersebut dianalisa dengan teori – teori pragmatic diantaranya, klasifikasi ilokusi oleh Searle (1976), teori konteks situasi oleh Hymes (1974) dan teori performativ oleh Austin (1962).*

*Hasil studi menunjukkan bahwa dari lima jenis ilokusi yang diajukan oleh Searle (1976) hanya empat jenis yang ditemukan dalam naskah yakni, "representatives", "directives", "commissives", dan "expressives", satu jenis lainnya yakni "declarations" tidak ditemukan. Selain itu, semua jenis dari ilokusi yang tidak berterima ditemukan dalam naskah film How to Train Your Dragon, yakni "misinvocations", "Misexecutions", dan "abuse".*

*Kata kunci: ilokusi, eksplikasi, ilokusi tidak berterima*

### 1. Background of the Study

Analyzing speech acts is not only narrowed into the analysis of dialogue and text, one of the subjects being analyzed currently is the movie script. Based on several previous analyses of speech acts in movies script, it is found that in movie script, there are various speech acts being performed by the characters in the movie. The research was focused on illocutionary act, one of the types of speech acts. The illocutionary acts being analyzed previously by several students can be easily found in any kinds of utterances, furthermore dimensionally illocutionary acts can always be linked into its perlocution and conditions surround it (Yule, 2000).

As known that in linguistics, started by the theory proposed by Austin (1962) the speech acts with its three dimensions can be classified into locution which are related to the predication or also called propositional act, illocutions which are related to the utterance with intended meaning and perlocution which is related to

the effect caused by the utterances. Looking at these links between the types of speech acts, Austin in Oishi (2006; 2) stated that in finding the intended meaning of an illocution one must also look at the speech condition that underlies the speech act. The felicity condition concept, the concept which reveals whether the speech acts being performed is valid or not and evaluate the validity of speech by its conventionality, actuality and intentionality is not yet analyzed in undergraduate thesis by the students of Udayana University.

Therefore, conducting research that elaborates about the failure of illocutionary acts using felicity condition concept, is such an interesting thing, the gap can be found in any communication that involves speech act particularly illocutionary act, when the gap is found, the illocutions are called the infelicitous illocutions. There are three types of infelicity conditions being elaborated in the analysis.

The movie as source of data was chosen randomly, it is the movie entitled *How to Train Your Dragon*, an animation movie which gains positive reviews both from the critiques and also the viewers. There some dialogues that performs gap between the speech condition found and the expected speech condition. The research entitled “*Infelicitous Illocutions in How to Train Your Dragon*”.

## **2. Problems of the Study**

By considering the background being elaborated above, the problems of the study are formulated as follows;

- a) What types of illocutions are found in *How to Train Your Dragon*?
- b) What are the explications of the illocutions found in *How to Train Your Dragon*?
- c) What types of infelicitous illocutions are found in *How to Train Your Dragon*?

## **3. Aims of the Study**

Generally, the aim of conducting this research is to apply the pragmatic theory and another linguistic related theory and concept that have been learnt in English Department, Faculty of Letters Udayana University, particularly those which are

related to speech act. Furthermore, the academic aim of conducting this research is to give contribution to the development of linguistic study.

Specifically, the aims that are projected to be achieved in this research are;

- a) To find out the types of illocutions found in *How to Train Your Dragon*
- b) To describe the explications of those illocutions in *How to Train Your Dragon*.
- c) To analyze the types of infelicitous illocutions in *How to Train Your Dragon*.

#### **4. Research Method**

The data were taken from the movie *How to Train Your Dragon*. The movie was produced by Dreamworks Cooperation in 2010, it is an 3D animated movie about the life in Viking Tribe. The story is mainly about a young Viking teenager named Hiccup who aspired to follow his tribe's tradition of becoming a dragon slayer.

The dialogues in the movie were the population of the data and taken as the samples were the conversations which contain infelicitous illocutionary acts. The illocutionary acts were then analyzed to find out the types, the explication and the infelicity condition. The movie was chosen at random, not all of dialogues were analyzed in the way being mentioned, the dialogues were the population and the sample was taken by scanning those illocutions that can be classified as the infelicitous one.

The data were collected in order to find out the illocutionary acts, the explication of the acts and the infelicitous acts. As the data were analyzed descriptively, the samples were described clearly and thoroughly in order to find out the types of illocution, the explications and the infelicitous illocutions.

#### **5. Analysis of Infelicitous Illocutions in How to Train Your Dragon**

Based on the theory proposed by Searle (1976), there are five types of illocutions; those are *representatives*, *directives*, *commissives*, *expressives* and *declarations*. Only four types were found in the movie script of *How to Train Your Dragon*. Bellow, presented some samples taken randomly to show the types of illocutions found in the movie script were presented as follows;

- a) Representatives

There are several types of representatives illocutions found in the movie script, those are *swearing, threatening, insisting, complaining, claiming, hypothesizing, and stating.*

b) Directives

There are five members of directives class found in the data source, those are *advising, daring, ordering, challenging* and *commanding*. The directives classes have the illocutionary points which attempt the speaker to get the hearer to do something.

c) Commissives

The commissives illocutions have the point to commit the speaker to some future courses of action. This understanding of commissives illocution is different from the one proposed by Austin previously (Searle; 1975). There were two type of commissives illocutions found in the dialogue, those are *intending* and *promising* illocutions.

d) Expressives

There were six types of expressives illocution found in the movies script, those are *apologizing, deploring, condoling, congratulating, thanking* and *regretting* illocutions. Those were classified based on the illocution taxonomy by Searle (1976) and also by analyzing on the usage and the meaning of the utterance itself.

The next analysis was directed to the explications of the illocutions. The explication was made based on Hymes Mode of SPEAKING. However, there are only seven variable being used in the analysis those are scene, participants, ends, act sequences, keys, instrumentalities, and norms. The last variable (genre) was not used, by considering that the data can be categorized into the same type of genre. The explication showed that the illocution performed in the movie were both direct and indirect and that there were some illocutions that needed further analysis on its appropriateness that was being elaborated on the next subchapter about infelicitous illocution

Lastly the analysis on the infelicitous illocution was conducted, it was found that all types of the infelicitous illocutions were found as follows;

a) Misinvocations

There are some misinvocations found in the movies script, by considering that in the conversation there were conditions when the speaker and the hearer did not share the same linguistics convention that made misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer, for example;

[Data 8- November 11, 2012]

GOBBER : I believe in learning on the job. Today is about survival. If you get blasted, you're dead. Quick, what's the first thing you're going to need?

HICCUP : A doctor?

Variable A.1 is being violated, as can be seen that the context of the utterance is about the battle against the dragons, Gobber as the speaker gave the assertion that the talk is about defeating the dragon, it became infelicitous since the hearer Hiccup did not share the same convention with him. By looking at the conversation, the context is about the battle and the armor need, Gobber wanted the trainee to answer which armor that will probably use in handling the dragon, but Hiccup gave an inappropriate response by saying "A doctor?", Hiccup did not share the same conventions, he thought that in a normal condition when one is about to die that person surely needs help from the doctor. In this example, there is also violation for the criteria A.2, it can be assessed by concerning on another aspect of speech situation (Oishi; 2006). The particular person and particular circumstances must be fulfilled in order to make a successful utterance or act.

b) Misexecutions

The infelicities were found in the utterances which showed that the speakers failed to present themselves as the performer of the act or when the harer did not acknowledge the utterance stated by the speaker.

[Data 3- November 11, 2012]

HICCUP : I'm going to kill you, Dragon. I'm gonna cut out your heart and take it to my father. I'm a Viking. I am a VIKING!

Hiccup was not able to present himself as the speaker who uttered threat to the dragons. It is counted as the violation of B.1, in which the audience did not notice his present as the speaker, furthermore the violation also included B.2, in the point

that the dragon did not hear and after he said that he threatened the dragon to stand behind him and to release its labored breathing. The dragon did not acknowledge the utterance and not even being threatened by that utterance, and furthermore, the response shown by the dragons indicated that the act had not been revitalized by the hearer.

c) Abuse

Lastly, abuse was also found in the movie script in those utterances which the speakers and hearers did not share the same thought and feeling that led to the same consequences after the act being performed.

[Data 16-November 11, 2012]

HICCUP : **Sorry, dad....** Okay, but I hit a Night Fury.

STOICK : --STOP! Just....stop.

The conversation was happened right after Hiccup made the commotion in the village. He believed that the arrow that he pointed out to the dragon was successfully shot a Night Furry, the most dangerous dragon veer known by the Vikings. He knew that he made mistakes, however he won't admit that as he believed that he made an achievement which is not known by the villagers. When he went back home, he apologize to his father, however the apology was a formal, he uttered that because he knew that his father must be very angry and saying sorry would make the condition better. The violation occurred in the point that as the speaker who uttered an apology Hiccup did not feel guilty for the menace that he made, he feel that he could not fully blame for the mistakes and he thought that he had done the right thing. And the violation of  $\Gamma.2$  also occurred as Stoick answering the apology by saying "STOP! Just....stop.", the apology made that the speaker should be answered by the utterance that show he accepted the apology, but in this case Stoick answered an apology with a commanding act for his son to stop talking.

## 6. Conclusion

The first conclusion is, there are four types speech acts found in the movie *How to Train Your Dragon*. Those are representatives, directives, expressive and

commissives. The declarations or declaratives acts were not found in the movie script as there are no speech situation and speech event that requires this illocutions. Most of the illocutions found are the declaratives which were then followed by representatives, expressives and lastly commissives. Secondly, the act being performed includes both literal and non-literal illocutions. Therefore, the explication analyzed using the Model of Speaking proposed by Hymes varied, some of the explication are closely related to the words being used while the others can not be assessed syntactically.

The third conclusion regarding to the last problem formulated, is that there were three types of infelicitous illocutions found in the movie script. This analysis based on the felicity condition criteria that was proposed by Austin (1962).

## 7. Bibliography

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian; Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Austin, J.L..1962. *How to do Things with Words*. Available from: <http://komm.bme.hu/wp-content/uploads>
- DeBlois, Dean. Hot to Train Your Dragon. Film Script. 2010. (cited 2012August) available from URL: <http://www.imsdb.com/scripts/How-to-Train-Your-Dragon.html>
- Hornby, AS. 2005. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Hymes, Dell H.. 1974. *Foundation in Sociolinguistics; An Ethnographic Approach*. Available from: [http://books.google.co.id/books/about/Foundations\\_in\\_Sociolinguistics.html](http://books.google.co.id/books/about/Foundations_in_Sociolinguistics.html)
- Lubis, Hamid Hasan. 1993. *Analisa Wacana Pragmatik*. Bandung:Angkasa
- Oishi, Etsuko. 2006. Austin's Speech Act Theory and The Speech Situation. *Esercizi Filosofici*, 1 (cited 2012 Aug 15). Available from: [www.units.it/eserfilo/art106/oishi106.pdf](http://www.units.it/eserfilo/art106/oishi106.pdf)
- Searle, John. 1975. A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Act (cited 2012 November 17). Available from: [www.mcps.umn.edu/assets/pdf/7.8\\_searle.pdf](http://www.mcps.umn.edu/assets/pdf/7.8_searle.pdf)