

DIRECTIVE ILLOCUTIONARY AND PERLOCUTIONARY ACTS IN MISSING (2023) MOVIE

ILOKUSI DIREKTIF DAN TINDAK PERLOKUSI DALAM FILM MISSING (2023)

Karina Dwianggita Aminnudin¹ & Muh. Kholiq²

^{1,2}Universitas Gunadarma

Jl. Margonda Raya 100, Depok, 16424, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

Email: karinadwianggitaaminnudin@gmail.com¹, kholiq@staff.gunadarma.ac.id²

Abstract

Communication in speech acts involves not only words but also action. The directive illocutionary is a form of speech act that attempts to persuade the hearer to do something. It refers to a specific statement that contains particular actions. This research aims to examine the occasions of directive illocutionary by Searl and perlocutionary acts by Austin in the Missing (2023) movie describing how the speaker carries their intention and how the interlocutor responds to the utterances as the action. The researcher used descriptive qualitative method. The data for analysis was obtained from the script dialogue of the Missing (2023) movie. The results of this research showed there are 83 data contained the 6 types of directive illocutionary acts, those are: Asking (41), Commanding (17), Requesting (7), Forbidding (5), Begging (6), and Suggesting (7). There are 40 successful perlocutionary acts and 37 unsuccessful perlocutionary acts that occurred in the movie.

Keywords: Directive illocutionary acts, movie, perlocutionary acts, speech acts

Abstrak

Komunikasi dalam tindak tutur tidak hanya melibatkan kata-kata, tetapi juga tindakan. Tindakan ilokusi direktif adalah suatu bentuk tindak tutur yang berusaha membujuk pendengarnya untuk melakukan sesuatu. Tindakan ini merujuk pada pernyataan khusus yang mengandung tindakan tertentu. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji peristiwa ilokusi direktif menggunakan teori Searl dan tindak perlokusi menggunakan teori Austin dalam film Missing (2023), mendeskripsikan bagaimana penutur menyampaikan maksud mereka dan bagaimana lawan bicara menanggapi ujaran tersebut sebagai tindakan. Peneliti menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Data untuk analisis diperoleh dari naskah dialog film Missing (2023). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan terdapat 83 data yang memuat 6 jenis tindak ilokusi direktif, yaitu: Asking (41), Commanding (17), Requesting (7), Forbidding (5), Begging (6), dan Suggesting (7). Terdapat 40 tindakan perlokusi yang berhasil dan 37 tindakan perlokusi yang tidak berhasil terjadi dalam film tersebut.

Kata kunci: Film, tindakan ilokusi direktif, tindakan perlokusi, tindak tutur

Introduction

Effective communication is an essential element of our society, and language plays an important role in making it possible. Language is commonly seen as a means by which thoughts are conveyed, serving as a framework of expression that facilitates the transmission of ideas from one individual to another (Finegan, 2008). It may be used as the main way for people to convey their ideas, thoughts, opinions, and feelings to others, which promotes social connection and information sharing. Effective communication would be impracticable without language, and the core of society would be severely undermined.

Successful communication necessitates a speaker and a listener who comprehend and respond to the conveyed message. Nevertheless, disparities in cultural backgrounds may occasionally result in misunderstandings between speakers and listeners. Individual can acquire knowledge about pragmatics, which pertains to comprehending the contextual meaning of language to prevent such misunderstanding. Individuals can effectively engage in cross-cultural communication, ensuring their messages are accurately conveyed and understood by learning pragmatics.

Yule (1996) asserted that exploring language from a pragmatics perspective provides the benefit of enabling discussions on the intended meanings, assumptions, purposes, and actions carried out by individuals during speech. One of the pragmatic aspects which associated with communication is speech act. Speech act involves examining the meaning and purpose of an utterance. It focuses on the actions performed by the speaker to convey their message and provides an explanation of the intentions and functions behind their speech.

Austin (1962) defined speech acts as the actions that are carried out when saying something (Cutting, 2002). He examined the theory of speech acts and categorized them into three types: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Yule (1996) determined that the locutionary act involves the production of utterances which carry a coherent and meaningful utterances. Moreover, Austin (1962) said that illocutionary act is performing an act in saying something. And perlocutionary act is the effect of an utterance used to perform speech act (Yule, 1996). In other words, perlocutionary refers to the type of speech where the speaker intends to produce a particular impact or action on the hearer through their utterances.

Based on Searle (1979), illocutionary acts can be categorized into five types: representative, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaration. Among these, the directive illocutionary act is frequently encountered in communication, where the speaker intends to persuade the hearer to carry out a particular action. It is a typical method of delivering requests, suggestions, warnings, orders, and prohibitions to others. The main goal of directive is to influence the listener to take action with the intention of achieving a desired outcome.

Talking about the directive illocutionary acts, their usage extends beyond the conversation of a daily basis, they can also be observed in the variety of movie genres, including romance, horror, action, comedy, and many more. In movies, characters often interact through dialogue that can be possible to analyze their utterance utilizing speech acts' theory.

After all the explanation above, this research aims to explore the types of directive illocutionary acts occurred in Missing (2023) movie and the successful or unsuccessful perlocutionary acts in the movie. Previous studies by scholars have examined directive illocutionary acts in various contexts, including novel (Arvanti, 2022), podcast (Salsabila, 2022), talk show on

YouTube (Sasanaputra & Mubarak, 2021), speech (Attamimy et al., 2020), television advertisements, and television advertisements (Pika, 2017). There are similarities and differences between this research and the first previous research by Arvanti (2022). The similarities are the theory, the method, and the aim of the research. The theory was from directives illocutionary acts by Searl's theory and perlocutionary acts' theory by Austin. Descriptive qualitative as a method, and the aims to analyse the type of directives illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. The difference is the object. Previous research used the Girl who Fell Beneath the Sea by Axie Oh Novel, while this research is used Missing (2023) movie as the object. For the second previous research by Salsabila (2022), the similarities are the theory and the method. This research and previous research used Searl's theory and descriptive qualitative method. The differences are the aim and the object. the aim of previous research is determined how the type used in the two best health podcast videos, while this research aims to examine perlocutionary acts describing how the speaker carries their intention and how the interlocutor responds to the utterances as the action. Another difference is the previous research used

Talking to Your Kids About the Coronavirus (Covid 19) and Social Distancing Doesn't Mean Social Isolation - Managing Stress and Anxiety podcast video, while this research used Missing (2023) Movie as the object.

The third previous research is from Sasanaputra & Mubarak (2021), the similarity is the method. The method is used descriptive qualitative method. The differences are the aim, the theory and the object. This research aims to examine perlocutionary acts describing how the speaker carries their intention and how the interlocutor responds to the utterances as the action, while the previous research aims to find out the function of those directives acts that employed by the speaker. The previous research is used Kreidler's theory, while this research is used Searl's theory. And the object of this research is used Missing (2023) Movie, while the previous research is used James Corden's talk show on YouTube channel. The last previous research is from Pika (2017), the similarities are the theory and the method. The theory was from Searle's theory, and descriptive qualitative as the method. The differences are the aim and the object. The previous research aims to describe kind of direct and indirect illocutionary act which was performed in *mobile network operator* on television

advertisement, while this research aims to describe the perlocutionary acts found in the movie. This research used Missing (2023) movie as the object, while the previous research used Television Advertisements *Mobile Network Operator* as the object.

Yule (2010) describes pragmatics as a linguistic field concerned with exploring the connection between an utterance and its context. Furthermore, according to Yule (1996), pragmatics delves into the intended meanings, assumptions, intentions, and objectives that individuals express when they communicate. Thereby, pragmatics is focused on how hearers comprehend a speaker's message by taking into account the contextual information that may not be explicitly stated in the utterance.

Similar to Yule, Leech (1983) stated that pragmatics focuses on the way meaning is shaped by speech contexts. It can be described as the examination of how statements take on significance based on the particular communication. In line with Leech (1983), Peccei (1999) stated that pragmatics centre on dimension of meaning that cannot be anticipated by linguistic knowledge and considers one's understanding of the physical and social environment.

To provide more comprehensive explanation, Griffiths (2006) clarifies that

pragmatics delves into the utilization of these linguistic tools, which encompass the knowledge embedded in a language's vocabulary and its structures for constructing more complex meanings, extending all the way to sentence-level meanings, within the context of meaningful communication. This entails the study of how our comprehension of language interacts with our comprehension of the world, while also giving consideration to the particular situations where language is employed. It encompasses the manner in which meaning is conveyed not solely through the words themselves but also through various situational factors like intonation, non-verbal cues, and the social and cultural environment in which communication occurs.

One fundamental area of study in pragmatics is speech acts, which plays a crucial role in effective communication. The theory of speech acts was originally proposed by Austin (1962) and further developed by Searle (1979). Based on Austin (1962), speech acts refer to the actions carried out when expressing oneself. Searle (1979) expands on this notion, stating that communication is not solely reliant on words, symbols, or sentences, but rather it involves the performance of speech acts through the use

of those linguistic elements. Otherwise stated, when individuals express themselves, they not only produce utterances comprising words and grammar but also carry out actions through their speech.

Austin (1962) divided speech acts into three types, they are: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. The locutionary act pertains to the act of physically uttering a sentence or phrase. The illocutionary act involves performing an action through speech. And Yule (1996) stated that the perlocutionary act refers to the impact or effect an utterance has on the hearer, aiming to achieve a specific response after the speaker delivers a message. In simpler terms, the perlocutionary act is the type of speech act intended to produce a particular effect on the hearer following the speaker's expression.

Searle (1979) contended that the types of illocutionary acts that aim to prompt or persuade the hearer to take a specific action is directive illocutionary acts. This action reflects the speaker's purpose or what speaker desires the hearer to take particular action which directly connected to the perlocutionary acts. there are several types of directive illocutionary acts which will explain below:

Asking

Searle (1979) mentioned that asking is the act of inquiring or stating something with the purpose of receiving a response, obtaining information, or eliciting a specific action. The verb *ask* has two directive meanings: requesting someone to perform an action and posing a question to elicit a correct answer from the hearer. The hearer may respond briefly with *yes* or *no* or provide further explanation for clarification if needed (Vanderveken, 1990). For example: *Are you sleep?*. This question asks the hearer to provide a verbal response of either *yes* or *no*.

Commanding

Commanding is having some level of authority or at least seeming to have institutionalized power (Vanderveken, 1990). It means giving orders from a position of authority. In the context of commanding, the speaker possesses both the authority and responsibility for those command, while the recipient has the obligation and responsibility for carrying out the command. Commanding typically entails the imposition of an obligation, wherein the speaker exerts complete control over the actions of the hearer. For example: *Put your hands up and*

drop the weapon! This is the police. This utterance is made by a police officer who has the authority to enforce the law.

Requesting

Requesting is a form of action to ask someone to do something formally and politely. Vanderveken (1990) states that when using a request, the individual being spoken to has the option to refuse or reject the request without any obligation. The aim of making a request is to persuade the hearer to take a particular action towards the speaker's desire. For the example: *Could you pass me the salt, please?*. This utterance is spoken by the speaker whether the hearer could pass the salt for the speaker or refuse the speaker's request.

Forbidding

Forbidding is the form of action to order somebody not to do something. According to Vanderveken (1990), forbidding is the type of directive that necessitates the hearer to abstain from engaging in a particular action. Forbidding is similar to commanding, but its purpose is to prevent the hearer from taking a particular action. For example: *Don't touch that!*. This utterance is

explicitly telling the hearer not to touch a specific object or thing.

Begging

Begging is the action to ask somebody for something especially in an anxious way because you want or need it very much. Begging expresses a great desire for whatever they are pleading for. Begging entails the speaker urgently and desperately begging that the hearer carry out an action because the speaker feels they are hopeless of doing things on their own and need help. Begging is similar to requesting and suggesting, but it emphasizes the speaker's sense of urgency and deep desire for the hearer to accomplish the request. For example: *Please, can you lend me some money? I'm in a really tough situation right now.* This utterance made by the speaker to the hearer that the speaker is pleading financial assistance.

Suggesting

Suggesting is to put forward an idea or a plan for other people to think about. It is a form of directive speech act that involves making a mild or gentle effort to persuade someone to do something (Vanderveken, 1990). The aim behind suggestions is to have

an impact on the hearer's behavior or decision-making. When making a suggestion, the speaker expresses their belief that a particular course of action is the most favorable choice for the hearer. Nonetheless, the hearer retains the freedom to accept or decline the suggestion. For example: *How about we collaborate on this project together and share our ideas?.* This utterance proposes working together on a specific project and encourages the sharing of ideas whether the hearer freedom to accept the suggestion or not.

Method

The researcher utilized a descriptive qualitative approach to examine the data during the research process. This approach focuses on comprehending the significance and consequences of the gathered data, rather than solely quantifying the numerical values it holds. According to Creswell (2018), *Qualitative research begins with assumptions and the use of interpretive/theoretical frameworks that inform the study of research problems addressing the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem.* Qualitative research aims to comprehend and interpret the significance of human behaviour and interactions within

specific situations from the researcher's perspective. This research employs descriptive qualitative approach to examine the varieties of directive illocutionary and perlocutionary acts within the dialogues presented in the movie.

Based on Neuman (2012), Qualitative data exist in the form of photos, written text, phrases, or symbols that portray or represent people, actions, and events in social life. The data collected by the researcher is in the form of written text, specifically the script from the dialogues that related to the directive illocutionary and perlocutionary acts based on John. R. Searle's and John L. Austin's theory in the movie *Missing* (2023). Hence, the utilization of descriptive qualitative approach is suitable for this study.

There are several steps in collecting the data of this research. First, watching *Missing* (2023) movie for several times. Second, identifying the relevant scenes and dialogues in the movie related to illocutionary and perlocutionary theories. Last, categorizing the dialogue in the movie according to the theory of directive illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.

Furthermore, there are several procedures in analyzing the data of this research. First, classifying the data into six types of the directive illocutionary acts based

on Searle and Austin theory. Second, analysing the data by examining to every aspect of the dialogue, scenes, and situational contexts depicted in the movie. The last, concluding the findings derived from the examined data.

Result and Discussion

The following table presents the data on the occurrences of directive illocutionary acts in the movie *Missing* (2023), based on Searle (1979) theory. The researcher identified a total of 83 data that contained of directive illocutionary act obtained in the movie as displayed.

It can be seen from the table 1 that the data are distinguished into six types of directives illocutionary acts. From the total of 83 data, there are 41 data of asking, 17 data of commanding, 7 data of requesting, 5 data of forbidding, 6 data of begging, and 7 data of suggesting.

Table 2 shows the data of successful and unsuccessful perlocutionary acts in *Missing* (2023) movie based on Austin's (1962) theory. According to Dzumillah (2016) in her previous research, the term *successful* was utilized to describe situations where the intended perlocutionary acts were accomplished, while the term *unsuccessful* was

Table 1. Types of Directives Illocutionary Acts

No	Types	Amount
1	Asking	41
2	Commanding	17
3	Requesting	7
4	Forbidding	5
5	Begging	6
6	Suggesting	7
	Total	83

Table 2. Types of Perlocutionary Acts

No.	Types	Amount
1	Successful	40
2	Unsuccessful	37
	Total	77

used to denote the situations where the expected perlocutionary acts did not occur. From the table 2, from 77 data, successful perlocutionary acts took place 40 times and unsuccessful perlocutionary acts occurred 37 times. In perlocutionary acts, the interlocutor commonly responded with concise verbal replies in order to prevent additional confusion. This case predominantly unfolded when the interlocutor chose to answer in a curt or direct manner. On the other hand, unsuccessful perlocutionary acts occurred when the other person did not provide a response. This condition mainly arose when the interlocutor was either unable to respond or deliberately decided not to answer. The comprehensive study of the two tables above will be described in the discussion below:

Asking

Datum 1

Duration 10:17 – 10:20

June: Wait, Vee, she's here!

Veena: Who?

June: Heather. My mom's friend.

The bold words spoken by Veena is categorized as directive illocutionary act of asking. Veena's primary is to seek clarification and gather information. She responds to June's statement by asking, *Who?* This reflects her desire to understand and know more about the person June is referring to. Veena's question arises from her curiosity about the identity of the person mentioned by June. Her role in this context is that of an inquirer, seeking further details to comprehend the situation. And the perlocutionary act of this dialogue can be

considered successful, because June promptly responds to Veena's question with clarity. She identifies the person as Heather, specifying that she is her mom's friend. June's response fulfils Veena's quest for information. Her clear and concise answer provides the requested details and answers Veena's question. In this case, June as the interlocutor successfully fulfils the perlocutionary act by offering a straightforward response to Veena's query.

Datum 2

Duration 17:17 – 17:23

June: Does anyone speak English?

Receptionist: No, I'm sorry. [man speaks in Spanish]

The utterance spoken by June is classified as directive illocutionary act of asking. June's primary intention is to seek information and inquire about the presence of English speakers. She poses the question, *Does anyone speak English?* to ascertain if there is someone who can assist her in her preferred language. June's role in this context is that of a communicator with a specific need for English-language communication. Her illocutionary act serves as a request for assistance or information. The perlocutionary acts in this dialogue can be considered as an unsuccessful perlocutionary act because the

receptionist responds to June's inquiry by conveying that there is no one available who speaks English. In this case, the receptionist's intention is to inform June of the language limitations at that moment. The response provided by the receptionist signifies that English-speaking assistance is not available. This outcome, however, is not aligned with June's likely preference for English communication.

Commanding

Datum 3

Duration 1:35:06 - 1:36:15

June: I need you to go to my Instagram and find a picture. Javi, please hurry.

Javier: What's the account name?

June's statement, *I need you to go to my Instagram and find a picture*, can be classified as commanding. June issues a direct command to Javier. Her primary intention is to instruct him to access her Instagram account and locate a specific picture. The tone of her request conveys a sense of urgency, indicating that she requires immediate action. In this context, June plays the role of the issuer of a command, seeking Javier's assistance in a digital task that she deems important and time-sensitive. The perlocutionary acts in this dialogue can be considered as successful perlocutionary act

because Javier promptly responds to June's command by seeking the necessary information to fulfil her request. He inquires about the account name, demonstrating his readiness to carry out the task. It can be seen from the dialogue above that Javier's response *What's the account name?*, it indicates that Javier follows the June's command, by asking the specified Instagram account to find the requested picture. Javier's response aligns with June's expectation. He acknowledges the urgency in her request and seeks the essential details to initiate the task of locating the specified picture on her Instagram account.

Datum 4

Duration 1:05:48 – 1:05:55

June: I'm syncing to the watch now. I need you to stay on the phone while I'm in there in case something happens.

Javier: June, I'm sorry. It's too dangerous.

The bold words can be categorized as the type of commanding. June issues a direct command to Javier. Her primary aim is to instruct him to stay on the phone while she performs the syncing process with her watch. The tone of her request implies a sense of urgency and emphasizes the importance of his presence as a safety measure during this technical task. In this context, June assumes

the role of the commander, seeking Javier's participation in a potentially challenging or risky task that requires technical support. Her illocutionary act serves as a clear instruction regarding the role she expects him to play. The perlocutionary act of this dialogue can be seen as unsuccessful as Javier responds to June's command by expressing concerns about the perceived danger associated with her request. He indicates that it is too dangerous for him to comply with her instruction. Javier's response signifies his reluctance to follow June's command due to safety concerns. His decision not to comply with the request is based on his judgment that participating in the task may put him in harm's way. The desired outcome of June's instruction is not achieved, therefore Javier as the interlocutor failed to fulfill the perlocutionary act.

Requesting

Datum 5

Duration 1:35:06 - 1:36:15

Grace: June, listen to me. I need you to pick us up on Monday at LAX. Can you do that?

June: Yes, ma'am.

The dialogue above can be considered as directive illocutionary of requesting. It can be seen from Grace's utterance in bold words *Can you do that?*. Grace is making a specific

request of her daughter, June. She asks June if she can pick them up on a specified day (Monday) at a particular location (LAX). The tone of her request is polite and indicates that she seeks June's willingness and ability to fulfil this request. Grace assumes the role of the requester, expressing her need for transportation from the airport. Her illocutionary act is one of seeking assistance from June in the form of a favor. The perlocutionary act in this dialogue can be categorized as successful perlocutionary act. June responds to Grace's request by indicating her willingness and agreement to fulfil the requested task. She acknowledges that she can indeed pick them up at LAX on the specified day. June's response confirms her compliance with Grace's request, signifying her readiness to provide the requested service. Her reply aligns with the desired outcome of Grace's request.

Datum 6

Duration 1:35:43

Javier: I need to use the navigation. Please do not call again. Okay? Bye.

June: No, no, no. Javi, please! I'm sorry about what I said.

The utterance spoken by Javier's utterance in bold words *Please do not call again. Okay?* is classified as both of

requesting and forbidding due to the use of word *please*. Javier's use of *please* softens the directive, making it a polite request for June not to call again during the time he needs to use the navigation. Therefore, there is an element of requesting in this element, but the primary intention is to set a boundary and in essence, forbid June from calling again during this time. Javier assumes the role of the speaker who needs uninterrupted access to the navigation system, primarily due to safety concerns or practicality while driving. The perlocutionary acts in this dialogue can be considered as an unsuccessful perlocutionary act. In response to Javier's request and implied forbidding, June pleads with Javier. Her intention is to persuade him to change his decision and to express her regret for something she said earlier, attempting to undo any offense caused. June's response signifies her inability to adhere to Javier's request and boundary-setting. Her actions indicate a desire to persuade Javier to reconsider and possibly forgive any prior words that may have caused offense.

Forbidding

Datum 7

Duration 1:26:23

James: And don't let daddy find you. Okay?

The bold words can be classified as directive illocutionary act of forbidding. James is the speaker in this scenario, and his primary intention is to give a clear and direct prohibition to his daughter, June. He uses the word *don't* to create a clear boundary and explicitly instructs June not to allow him to find her. He is using the word *don't* to prohibit June from allowing him to locate her. This dialogue occurs during a game of hide-and-seek, where James is taking on the role of the one seeking to find June. His use of forbidding language is in the context of the game, emphasizing the rules and the boundaries of the activity. Perlocutionary act in this dialogue is considered as successful as in the duration 1:26:23, June's response effectively fulfils James's directive. She understands his forbidding statement and acts in accordance with his directive by hiding and successfully avoiding being found. The success of this perlocutionary act lies in June's ability to comply with her father's prohibition during their interaction in the context of the game.

Datum 8

Duration 1:38:40

June: Dad. Dad, please. Please don't do this. Please, if you can hear me, just open the door, please! She needs help! Please!

The bold utterance can be categorized as forbidding type. It can be seen from the June's statement in bold words *Please don't do this*, as she is imploring her dad not to cease a particular action. Her use of the word *please* repeatedly emphasizes the urgency and emotional significance of her request, creating a strong tone of forbidding. She is urging her father not to continue with his current action, which is locking the door. Additionally, June explicitly states, *Please don't do this*, which is a clear expression of her forbidding intention. This dialogue unfolds in a highly distressing and intense situation. June's mother, Grace, is in immediate need of help, and June is desperately pleading with her father to open the door to provide assistance. The context of a dire situation amplifies the emotional and urgent nature of June's forbidding illocutionary act. From the scene of this dialogue, the perlocutionary act in this dialogue is considered as an unsuccessful perlocutionary act. In this context, her dad didn't comply with June's prohibitions. Instead, he chooses to lock the door and leave, which is contrary to June's urgent plea. The desire outcome for June was for her father to stop his action and open the door to help her mother, but her father's response does not align with this intention. Therefore,

June as the speaker failed to achieve the expected perlocutionary act.

Begging

Datum 9

Duration 1:35:54

June: I found my mom, but we're running out of time. Please, I need your help. Please.

Javier: What?

The bold utterance is classified as directive illocutionary act of begging. June's repeated statements of *please* and her emotional plea indicate as begging type. She uses heartfelt emotional appeals, repetition of the word *please*, and urgent requests to implore Javier for assistance. Her intention is to persuade and convince Javier to provide help due to the critical and time-sensitive nature of the situation. June's imploring is a clear indication of her emotional and urgent plea for assistance. The context is marked by a sense of urgency and distress. June has found her mother but emphasizes that they are running out of time. Her emotional plea carries added weight as she pleads for Javier's help in a dire situation, heightening the emotional significance of her begging illocutionary act. The perlocutionary act of this dialogue can be considered as successful. In response to June's emotional plea and

imploring, Javier expresses his confusion and seeks further clarification. His reply, *What?* is indicative of his willingness to engage and assist. Javier's response shows that he is open to understanding what he can do to help June in this dire situation.

Datum 10

Duration 1:38:20

June: Please. No, no, no! Hey! Hey, let us out! Let us out!

The bold words can be considered as directive illocutionary act of begging. It can be seen from the duration of scene 1:38:20, June, as the speaker, is utilizing a directive illocutionary act of begging. Her intention is to urgently plead with James, her father, for their release. June's use of phrases like *please* and repeated *no* serves to express the urgency and desperation of her request. She implores James to let them out, and her emotional plea reflects the distressing situation in the storyline. The perlocutionary act of this dialogue can be seen as unsuccessful as in the scene of the movie. James refuses to comply with her request. His choice to lock the door and not release them signifies a refusal to fulfil the perlocutionary act. Despite June's emotional and urgent begging, James does not respond by letting

them out. Therefore, James as the interlocutor failed to fulfill the perlocutionary act.

Suggesting

Datum 11

Duration 38:45 - 38:50

Javier: Maybe you should tell la policia about the lock. They maybe know something.

June: Sure thing.

The utterance is spoken by Javier is classified as suggesting type. Javier is proposing a course of action for June to consider, specifically suggesting that she inform the police about the locked situation, as they might have relevant information. Javier's suggestion is made in response to the situation they are facing, where they are dealing with a locked situation. His recommendation to involve the police indicates his willingness to find a solution to the issue. The perlocutionary act in this dialogue is successful because June, as the hearer, responds to Javier's suggestion with agreement and acceptance. Her phrase *Sure thing* reflects her willingness to act on Javier's advice and take the recommended action of informing the police. She acknowledges Javier's suggestion and confirms her intention to follow through with it.

Datum 12

Duration 1:06:02

Javier: Maybe right now you need to trust them.

Javier's statement, *maybe right now you need to trust them*, can be categorized as suggesting type. He is offering a suggestion to June. He is advising her to consider placing trust in the police at this moment. His intention is to guide June and provide a potential course of action for her to take, given the circumstances they are facing. Javier's suggestion arises from his perspective on the situation, which implies that trusting the police might be the best course of action. It conveys a sense of advice and a willingness to assist June in navigating the situation.

The perlocutionary act of this dialogue is unsuccessful as can be seen in the scene of the movie that June ignores Javier's suggestion and does not demonstrate any intention to follow it by going to the Heather's office instead of staying at home and trust the police. June's decision to ignore Javier's suggestion and take an alternative course of action demonstrates her autonomy and the independent choices she makes based on her perspective. Her response suggests that she has her reasons for not trusting the police and has chosen a different

approach. Therefore, June as the interlocutor failed to fulfil the perlocutionary act.

the interlocutor declines or disregards the directive illocutionary act.

Conclusion

The researcher has concluded that the Missing (2023) movie presents various illocutionary acts discussed in Austin and Searle's theory. Within these acts, six types of directive illocutionary acts are observed. These include asking (seeking information), commanding (issuing direct orders), requesting (asking politely), forbidding (prohibiting actions), begging (expressing strong desire), and suggesting (providing suggestions). Upon examining the data, it is found that *asking* is the most frequently occurring type, appearing 41 times throughout the movie. Conversely, *forbidding* is the least frequent with only 5 times.

Furthermore, the researcher identifies two types of perlocutionary acts resulting from the interlocutor's response after understanding the directive illocutionary act. These are successful and unsuccessful perlocutionary acts. Successful perlocutionary acts occur when the interlocutor fulfills the speaker's intention by providing an appropriate response or taking the intended action. On the other hand, unsuccessful perlocutionary acts occur when

Reference

- Arvanti, F. T. (2022). *Directive Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts Found in the Girl Who Fell Beneath the Sea by Axie Oh*. Jakarta: Gunadarma University.
- Attamimy, H. F., Junining, E., & Khasanah, I. (2020). Speech Act Analysis of Jacinda Ardern about Covid-19. *Elite Journal Volume 7 Nomor 2*, 209-224.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *HOW TO DO THINGS WITH WORDS*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* fifth edition. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge
- Dzumillah, A. (2016). *The Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Act in The Reasonable Doubt, A Movie Directed by Peter Howitt*. Jakarta: Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University.
- Finegan, E. (2008). *Language its structure and use* 5th edition. Boston: United States:

- Thomson Higher Education.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *The Principle of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Neuman, W. L. (2012). *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (3rd Edition). London: Pearson Education, Inc
- Peccei, J. S. (1999). *Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Pika. (2017). *The Illocutionary Act of Television Advertisements "Mobile Network Operator" (Pragmatic Analysis)*. Makassar: Universitas Islam Negri Alauddin Makassar.
- Salsabila, J. K. (2022). *An Analysis of Directive Illocutionary Acts in Podcast Best Health*. Malang: Islamic State University Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
- Sasanaputra, R., & Mubarak, Z. H. (2021). Kinds and Function of Directive Acts in YouTube Channel James Corden "Spill Your Guts" Talkshow. *Journal Basis (Journal Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris Universitas Putera Batam)*, 23-30.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression And Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and Speech Acts: Volume 1, Principles of Language Use* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language (4 ed)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.