

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter contains all the significant theories related to this research, as well as various aspects that serve as support for this research. This research is supported by John R. Searle's theory about representative speech acts.

A. Pragmatics

According to Crystal (1987, in Zakiah, 2017) pragmatics studies language in social interaction and the effect of our choices on others. In theory, people freely say everything, but in practice, there are some rules to follow when speaking. Pragmatic boundaries are the rules of language usage of forms and meanings associated with the speaker's purpose, context, and condition. In pragmatics, meaning is defined in relation to speakers or language users (Parker, 1986, p. 4).

Pragmatics is the study of where belief is communicates more than what is uttered. This has an impact on the analysis of what words imply rather than the meaning of words or phrases in a speech (Yule, 1996). What Yule wants to underline is that a speaker's meaning is comprises of more than simply the words they have spoken, and that paying attention to the context is the best way to understand what a speaker has said. This is connects to Leech (1983) assumption that pragmatism is the study of the meaning of the circumstances in which the discourse occurs.

Yule (1996) states pragmatics must consider factors such as whom people talk to, where they talk, when they communicate, and what situations they are in to decide how they will express what they want to say. It is impossible to simply determine or judge the words expressed by others when there are certain contextual factors to

consider. In this regard, Richard (2002) states that pragmatics is research that examines the use of language in communication in terms of sentences and contexts, as well as the type of circumstance in which the communication occurs.

Levinson (1983) argues that pragmatics is the study of those principles that will explain why a certain set of sentences are anomalous, or impossible to utter. Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammatical, or encoded in the structure of a language. Therefore, we need to make a distinction between the usual meaning of a word or sentence and the meaning it has in certain situations. For this reason, it is necessary to differentiate between meaning and use, because pragmatics is controversial among linguists.

Yule (1996) states pragmatics as the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the user of those forms. He divided pragmatics into four dimensions:

1. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. The interpretation of this concerned with the interpretation of the speaker meaning by the listener.

For example:

- *“I need a bowl of rice!”*

The listener will interpret that the person might be hungry.

2. Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. This is the interpretation of what people exactly mean in a specific context and how the context influence what is said, for example:

- *“Nabe is in Liya’s house. But then Liya asked Nabe to bring a glass of water.”*

The utterances are not fit in the context, because normally Liya would offer Nabe something to drink at Liya's place instead of telling her to bring something. So this could see how context influence the meaning.

3. Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communication than is said. It means that the listener have to consider the invisible meaning. For example:

- *“Can you read the first sentence on the first page of your paper?”*

The listener might think that there is something wrong in that sentence.

4. Pragmatics is the study of the expresstion of relative distance, so the physical and social closeness determines how much needs to be said.

For example:

- *“Throw that!”*

The above utterance will not be understood by people who have nothing to do with the speaker, only the speaker and the listener could understand what “that” is refer to.

People utilize pragmatics to decipher the hidden or implicit meaning of a word, which can be interpreted in a variety of ways. People's perceptions of a word (or a person's utterances) can be different based on something that the speakers and listeners being in the specific situation (Brown K. , 2006, p. 17).

According to Yule (1996) using pragmatics approaches to study language has both advantages and disadvantages. One of the advantages of pragmatics is that it allows individuals to examine the speaker's inferred meaning, hidden purposes, and the

kinds of actions they take when speaking. Meanwhile, when it comes to analyze the idea of pragmatics, people have a tendency to be inconsistent and objective. That triggers an interest in pragmatics, such that people are now more interest in learning pragmatics and attempting to comprehend others through linguistic visions. Pragmatics is also a difficult subject to study because it entails gaining a through understanding of what is on other people's minds.

Thomas (1995) divides the tendency in pragmatics into two parts. The first one, using a social point of view, connects pragmatics with speaker's meaning. The second, using a cognitive point of view, connects pragmatics with utterance interpretation. According to Searle on (Zakiah, 2018) speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, or making promises. In making utterances, people sometimes use implicit meaning and sometimes use explicit meaning. It depends on the circumstances and situation of the speakers and hearers.

B. Speech Acts

Speech acts are acts that refer to the information, knowledge, or facts that speakers want to express to partners said. According to Yule (1996) speech acts are interaction activities carried out simultaneously. Therefore, each speech acts has several types that have been grouped with the aim of achieving a certain goal.

There are certain aims beyond the words or phrases when a speaker says something. Austin (1962) explains that speech acts is an act that refer to the action performed by producing utterances. In line with this, Yule (1996, p. 47) states that speech acts is an acts which is performed via utterances. In stating the same idea, Birner (2013) also says that uttering something is equivalent to doing something. People can

take action by saying something. Through speech acts, the speaker can convey physical action merely through words and phrases. The acts taken are mostly determined by the spoken words.

Yule (1996) states that speech acts is a study of how the speakers and hearers use language. Bach (1979) explains that an action in verbal communication has a message in itself, so the communication is not only about language but also about action.

Austin (1967, in Huang, 2007) divided speech acts into three facet of speech act : (1) Locutionary acts, (2) illocutionary act, and (3) perlocutionary acts.

1. Locutionary Act

Locutionary act means the act of saying something that makes sense in a language, as the production of a meaningful linguistic expression. It contains a statement or information when speakers communicate with others. So, the utterance only has one meaning without any other reference to the hearer (Austin J. L., 1962).

2. Illocutionary Act

Illocutionary act is the act of doing something, illocutionary act is performed with intended meaning behind the utterance (Austin J. L., 1962). This is the primary focus of Austin and his successors: the numerous applications of language in society. In fact, the word "speech acts" is sometimes used to refer solely to illocutionary activities (Saeed, 2009).

3. Perlocutionary Act

Perlocutionary act is the act of affecting someone, the effect of the utterance can bring someone else do what it is said by the speaker. They tend to speak to make others do what they want to do. The three levels of speech acts can be used to analyze utterance of human in communication (Austin J. L., 1962).

C. Illocutionary Act

At the first knowledge of the illocutionary, Austin classify the illocution force into five name:

a. Verdictives

Verdictive are typified by the giving of a verdict, as the name implies, by a jury, arbitrator, or umpire. It is essentially giving a finding as to something fact or value, which is for different reasons hard to be certain about.

b. Exercitives

Exercitives are the exercising of powers, rights, or influence. For example are appointing, voting, ordering, urging, advising, warning, etc.

c. Commissives

Commissives are typified by promising or otherwise undertaking; they commit you to doing something, but include also declaration or announcements of intention, which are not promises, and also rather vague

things, which we may call espousals, as for example, siding with. They have obvious connection with verdictives and exercitives.

d. Behabitives

Behabitives are a very miscellaneous group, and have to do with attitudes and social behavior. For example are apologizing, congratulating, commending, condoling, cursing, and challenging.

e. Expositives

Expositives are difficult to define. They make plain how our utterances fit into the course of an argument or conversation, how we are using words, or in general, are expository. For example, I reply, I argue, I concede, I illustrate, I assume, I postulate.

(Austin J. L., 1975)

According to Searle (1976) that there are just five basic kinds of action that one can perform in speaking. The classification according to Searle are:

a. Representative

Representative is an action that involves the speaker on the truth of the expressed proposition. As an example; Declare, suggest, conclude, complain, demand, report. This type of illocutionary tends to be neutral in terms of politeness, and this can be put into collaborative categories. Example of this type of speech:

- “Nabe always excellent in its class.”

The utterances categorized as representative illocutionary act, because it contains information that the speaker is bound by the truth of the contents of the utterance. Speakers are responsible that the spoken utterance is facial expressions and can be proven by the reason that Nabe studies hard and always gets first rank in her class (Leech, p. 106).

b. Directive

Directive is an act intended to cause some effect through the act of the hearer, for example: ordering, commanding, pleading, requesting, suggesting, and advising. All of this often falls into the competitive category, and consists of a category of illocutions where negative manners become important. In contrast, some directives (such as invitations) are inherently polite. It should be noted that to eliminate confusion in the use of “directive” in relation to direct and indirect illocution. For example:

- *“Help me lift this table.”*

The example is included in the speech act of the type of directive because the speech is spoken of the intended speakers to perform appropriate actions mentioned in his speech which helps to lift the table. The indicator of the directive speech is the existence of an action performed by the hearer after hearing the speaker (Leech, p. 106).

c. Commissive

Commissive is an action that involves the speaker on some upcoming action, for example: promising, swearing, offering, praying. All of these

tend to be more convivial than competitive, executed precisely more to meet someone's interest than the speaker. Examples of commissive speech acts of commitment as follows:

- *“I am able to finish this task quickly.”*

It binds its speakers to finish the task as quick as possible. This brings consequences for him to fulfill what he has said (Leech, p. 106).

d. Expressive

Expressive is an act which has the function of expressing, or informing the speaker's psychological attitudes toward a state or statement predicted by the illocution, such as thanking, congratulating, forgiving, blaming, praising, expressing condolences. This type tends to be convivial and considered polite, but the opposite can also be justified. For example, expressive, like blaming and accusing.

- *“It's hard work to earn money, still the results can not meet the needs of families.”*

This speech is an expressive speech act complaining that can be interpreted as an evaluation of what he said, making the business that the results are always unable to meet the need of family life (Leech, p. 106).

e. Declarative

Declarative is an illustration that if its performance succeeds, will lead to a good correspondence between the propositional content and the reality.

For example: surrendering, firing, liberating, naming, isolating, lifting, pointing, deciding, and punishing (Leech, p. 106). For example:

- *“I accept my defeat.”*

This speech is a declarative speech act, because subject "I" declares that he accepts his defeat (Leech, p. 105).

D. Representative Speech act

According to Yule (1996) representatives are types of illocutionary acts that commit the speaker to believe about something is true or not. When performing this type of illocutionary act, it can be noted by some performative verbs, such as: state, tell, assert, correct, predict, report, remind, describe, inform, assure, agree, guess, claim, believe, conclude, etc.

The point of the representative is to commit the speaker to something that is being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition. All of the members of the representative class are assessable on the dimension of assessment, which includes true and false. Representatives illocutionary act related to facts, the goal is to provide information. This speech acts with regard to knowledge and data that has occurred or does not occur (Zakiah, 2018).

Kreidler (1998, p. 183) adds in the representative function, speakers and writers use language to convey what they know or believe; representative language is concerned with facts, as example, for actions in which the words state what the speakers believe, such as describing, claiming, hypothesizing, insisting, and predicting. It also refers to speech acts that describe states or events in the world, such as a statement of fact, a report, and a conclusion.

Searle (2005, p. 12) says that the purpose of the members of this class is to commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something's being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition. Paradigm case includes stating, reporting, concluding, complaining, suggesting (Leech, 2015).

1. Stating

Stating has a subjective content because the speaker says the information based on its understanding. Express something definitely or clearly in speech (Searle J. R., 2014). For example:

- *Sony: The earth is round.*

In this sentence Sony states that the earth is round. The word “*is*” indicated as stating.

- *Nabe: All men are the same*

The above utterance is included as stating, because Nabe states something based on the facts she knew. The word "are" can indicate the above utterance as stating.

2. Reporting

Reporting has a meaning that the speaker intend or informs the outcome of an action. This speech acts tend to be used by the speaker in telling something that the speaker knows by fact. Give a speech of something that speaker has observed, heard, or investigated (Searle J. R., 2014).

For example:

- *Nabe : Mom, Lisa take my cake in the refrigerator*

The word “*Mom*” indicates that Nabe reported to Mom. Speakers want to report that Lisa take her cake in the refrigerator.

- *“I saw him take the man's wallet at that crossroads!”*

The utterance above illustrates that "I" reports someone taking someone else's wallet, which is where the word "saw" there can indicate that "I" is reporting an incident to someone.

3. Concluding

Concluding means that the speaker wants to make speeches based on the previous description or bring (something) to an end. The utterance that arrive at a judgment or opinion by reasoning (Searle J. R., 2014). For example:

- *“The kitchen knife is the tool used by Jodi Ann Arias to kill Travis Alexander.”*

The word “*used in the murder of*” shows a statement that points to the conclusion. The speaker wants to tell the hearer that the kitchen knife is the tool used by Arias to kill Travis's.

4. Complaining

Speech complaining tends to be subjective because the speaker intends to express a perceived grievance to the hearer. Express dissatisfaction or

annoyance about a state of affairs or an event. When speakers feel disappointed with a thing, speakers can complain to the hearers (Searle J. R., 2014). For example:

- Maje : *Good afternoon, Sir. I just bought this keyboard, but when I try to click the “space” button it does not work..*

Bande : Let me take a look on the keyboard.

Bande : Oh you are right, but I can't repair this one, so I will replace your keyboard with the same new keyboard.

Maje : Oh sure.

The phrase “*does not work*” showing disappointment. The speaker feels dissatisfied because the keyboard not working properly.

5. Suggesting

Suggesting is the utterance that give to others who are affects by problems or difficulties, in essence suggestion is used to provide solutions. Suggestion can be submitted for consideration (Searle J. R., 2014). For example:

- Nabe : Mom, I think I love him.

Mother : *You should find another man*, honey.

The word “*should*” indicated as suggestion. Speakers advise the hearer to find another man. The representative illocutionary of suggesting, there are words like; advice, suggest, should.

(Zakiah, 2018)

E. Direct Speech Acts

Searle in (Brown & Yule, 1983) introduces a distinction between direct and indirect speech acts. This distinction is made on the basis of recognition of the intended perlocutionary effect of an utterance on a particular occasion.

According to Searle (1979) when someone makes an utterance, they are essentially performing an act. People can conduct the speaking act in two ways. It can be done in a direct or indirect manner. People do direct speech acts when they make an utterance with the same aim and meaning. Indirect speech acts, on the other hand, occur when people make an utterance with an indirect aim or goal.

Finch in (2000, p. 183) argues that direct speech acts is an act that have a direct connection with the structure used. In direct speech acts, the form of the utterance is in accordance with what the speaker intends to convey. Searle in (Cutting, 2002, p. 19) states that the speakers use direct speech acts to communicate the literal meaning that the words conventionally express.

A sentence or several sentences that report speech or thought in its original form, as phrased by the original speaker, is also called direct (Azar, p. 273). Someone uses direct speech acts to provide information directly to the listener. Usually, the speaker is a person who has a higher position or already has a close relationship with the listener. For example:

- *“I order you to revise your work”*

This sentence is a direct order sentence, the speaker can be a manager and the listener is his subordinate

An utterance is seen as a direct speech act when there is a direct relationship between the structure and the communicative function of the utterance. Direct speech acts therefore explicitly describe the intended meaning of the speaker behind making the utterance (Yule, p. 55).

F. Indirect Speech Acts

When a speaker uses mutually shared context knowledge, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, to express more than what he or she directly says, this is known as indirect expression. Yule (1996) states that indirect speech acts will happen if there is an indirect relationship between the structure and the function of the utterance. Another expert, Finch (2000, p. 183) states that indirect speech acts occur when there is an indirect relationship between a surface structure and function, and in indirect speech acts, the speaker means what the sentence means but something else as well.

People tend to use indirect speech acts primarily in the context of politeness, as they reduce the negative message conveyed by requests and directives. Searle states that an indirect speech act is one that is “performed by means of another” (Searle J. R., 1979). That means that there is an indirect relationship between the form and the function of the utterance. For example :

- *“I told to him that I could fix this handphone immediately.”*

The speaker does not explicitly state the intended meaning behind the utterance. It is the hearer’s task to analyse the utterance to understand its meaning (Yule, p. 56).

G. Criminal Psychology

The scientific study of the mind and behavior is known as psychology. The study of conscious and unconscious events, such as feelings and thoughts, is referred to as psychology. It is a hugely interdisciplinary academic field that bridges the gap between the natural and social sciences. Psychologists study the behaviors of individuals and communities as a social science.

According to Kalat (2016), the name psychology comes from the Greek words *psyche*, which means "soul" or "mind" and *logos* which means "word", so basically psychology is the study of mind or soul. Feldman (1993) provides a clearer definition when he states that psychology is the scientific study of behavior and mental processes. Gross (2015) asserts that psychology as a discipline aims to comprehend, predict, and govern human behavior. In other words, psychology is concerned with explaining, predicting, modifying, and improving the lives of people and the world in which they live.

Wilson (2019) argues that psychology's contribution to the courts dates back to 1896, when a psychologist named Albert von Schrenck-Notzing testified at a murder trial about the effects of suggestibility on witness testimony, and that, as a result of that action, psychological factors were taken into account in subsequent criminal, civil, and family trials.

In the courtroom, psychology plays a role in crime investigation and justice. Psychologists, particularly forensic psychologists, are frequently called upon by criminal and civil courts to conduct psychological evaluations in order to determine if the accused or plaintiff is fit to stand trial (Tshababa, 2020).

In ordinary language, a crime is an unlawful act punishable by a state or other authority. The term *crime* in modern criminal law, does not have any simple and universally accepted definition, though statutory definitions have been provided for specific purposes. A crime or offence (or criminal offence) is an act that is harmful not only to an individual but also to a community, society, or the state, according to one proposed definition ("a public wrong"). Such behavior is prohibited and penalized under the law (More, 2020).

Criminal psychology and criminal anthropology are related fields. The research looks into not only what motivates someone to commit a crime, but also how they react afterward. Criminal psychologists have a variety of responsibilities in the legal system, including testifying as witnesses in court proceedings to help the jury understand the criminal's mentality. Aspects of criminal conduct are also addressed by some types of psychotherapy. Criminal behavior is defined as "any sort of antisocial activity that is punishable by law but can also be punished by community norms." (Cherry, 2021).

The field is highly related to forensic psychology, and in some cases, the two terms are used interchangeably. One of the best-known duties of a criminal psychologist is known as offender profiling, also known as criminal profiling (Cherry, 2021).

Criminal profiling is one of the most obvious roles played by psychology in crime investigation. This is an investigative strategy used by psychologists or police officers to derive characteristics of an offender from his or her crime scene behavior. Psychological profiling, offender profiling, criminal investigative analysis, crime scene analysis, behavioural profiling, criminal personality profiling, socio-psychological profiling, and criminological profiling are all terms used to describe criminal profiling (Tshababa, 2020).

According to Douglas and Olshaker (1995), criminal profiling is the process of compiling a psychosomatic image of the known perpetrator of a crime using available facts about the crime and the crime scene. In support, Ebisike (2007) offender profiling is a crime investigation technique in which information acquired from the crime scene, witnesses, victims, autopsy findings, and information about an offender's behavior is utilized to create a profile of the type of person likely to commit the crime.

H. Youtube

Burgess and Green (2009, p. 1) state that Youtube is one of several competing services aims at removing technical barriers to mass video sharing on the internet. Users could post, publish, and view streaming, without high levels of technical knowledge. "Broadcast Yourself" is the slogan for the YouTube website. This means that the YouTube service is largely geared for regular individuals who wish to share films they've made.

People from all over the world upload videos to YouTube. As a result, YouTube offers a diverse collection of videos. Murder cases, court videos, sports bloopers, and other events recorded on camera are some examples. Some users have been able to turn YouTube into a viable business due to Google's revenue sharing program for advertisement clicks generated on video pages.

Users can group the videos they make and upload, the videos they watch and like, and the playlists of videos they create on their Youtube channel. JCS - Criminal Psychology is one of the YouTube channel created by a user named Jim Can't Swim.

JCS - Criminal Psychology, is an American Youtube Channel known for its crime documentaries. They create educational documentaries on specific individuals,

primarily focusing on publicly released recordings of their interviews or interrogations by police, where they analyze their individual behaviors and explain the mindset, actions, and techniques of the officers/interrogators involved.

