THE ANALYSIS OF THE ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS IN THERESA MAY'S *BRITAIN, THE GREAT MERITOCRACY* SPEECH

Maharani Saskia Puteri, M. Bahri Arifin, Famala Eka Sanhadi Rahayu

English Literature Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences
Mulawarman University
saskiamhrn.sm@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Political leaders used political speech that contained intentional purposes to suggest various political agenda. Theresa May, United Kingdom's prime minister from 2016 to 2019, used political speech entitled *Britain, the great meritocracy* to deliver British exit (Brexit). Therefore, to discover the purposes of May's speech, this study aimed to identify the types of illocutionary acts employed in the speech based on Searle's theory of the classification of illocutionary acts and the contexts underlying the illocutionary acts produced based on Hymes' SPEAKING model of contexts. To conduct this study, descriptive-qualitative method and content analysis approach were used. Then, the data collection was done by close reading, speech listening, and note taking techniques. After that, compiling, disassembling, reassembling, interpreting and concluding were taken as data analysis process. Finally, the results of the study showed that 4 (four) illocutionary act types namely assertives, directives, commissives, and expressives were employed in the speech. By these findings, assertive type was the most frequently used one as this type enabled the speaker to characterize her belief to be in true or false dimensions. Functionally, it transmitted the prominent purpose of the speech which was to show both preferences and disfavors of May upon Britain. Otherwise, declaration type was not found to fit in the specific context presented at that time that was to depict how Britain should be within May's term. Additionally, contexts underlying the emergence of the illocutionary acts in the speech were setting and scene, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms, and genre.
Keywords: illocutionary acts, *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech, Theresa May

ABSTRAK

Pemimpin politik menggunakan pidato politik yang berisi tujuan-tujuan dengan maksud tertentu untuk mengusulkan beragam agenda politik. Theresa May, perdana menteri Britania Raya dari tahun 2016 hingga 2019, menggunakan pidato politik berjudul Britain, the great meritocracy untuk mewujudkan British exit (Brexit). Oleh karena itu, untuk menemukan tujuan-tujuan dari pidato May, penelitian ini

bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi tipe-tipe tindak ilokusi di dalam pidatonya berdasarkan teori klasifikasi tindak ilokusi oleh Searle dan konteks yang melatarbelakangi tindak ilokusi yang dihasilkan berdasarkan model konteks SPEAKING oleh Hymes. Untuk melakukan penelitian ini, peneliti menggunakan metode deskriptif-kualitatif dan pendekatan analisis konten. Kemudian, peneliti mengumpulkan data dengan teknik membaca dengan cermat, mendengarkan pidato, dan membuat catatan. Setelah itu, proses analisis data meliputi kompilasi, pembongkaran, pemasangan kembali, penafsiran, dan penyimpulan. Akhirnya, hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa 4 (empat) tipe tindak ilokusi yakni asertif, direktif, komisif, dan ekspresif digunakan di dalam pidato tersebut. Berdasarkan temuan ini, tipe yang paling sering digunakan adalah asertif karena tipe ini memungkinkan pembicara untuk mencirikan keyakinannya pada dimensi benar atau salah. Secara fungsional, ini menjembatani tujuan utama dari pidato ini yaitu untuk menunjukkan beragam preferensi dan hal yang tidak diinginkan May pada Britania. Sebaliknya, tipe deklarasi tidak ditemukan untuk menyesuaikan konteks spesifik pada saat itu yakni untuk menyampaikan gambaran bagaimana Britania seharusnya selama May menjabat. Selain itu, konteks yang melatarbelakangi kemunculan tindak ilokusi di dalam pidato ini adalah latar dan suasana, peserta, akhir atau tujuan, urutan tindak, kunci, instrumentalitas, dan jenis atau aliran.

Kata kunci: *tindak ilokusi, pidato Britain, the great meritocracy, Theresa May*

A. INTRODUCTION

Comprehensive language is required to establish communication. Oftentimes, people communicate to mean various things such as requesting, informing, reporting or commanding. As practiced, communicative expressions frequently imparted after certain speech-making process which consists of intentional desires. These intentional desires are often expressed to represent certain force. To picture people's true meanings in communication, it may particularly depend on certain contexts including comprehending the force taken. Austin (1962, p.108-109) explains that in uttering a sentence, a speaker involves three different speech acts: locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. The second one, illucotionary acts, could assist meanings to be revealed as it is defined as utterances which have a certain (conventional) force. Speaking of which, speech act must be found in utterances as Yule (1996, p.47) defines speech acts as an action performed by the use of utterances to communicate.

Generally, utterances that carry speech acts are often found in political world in ways political speeches done to imply certain purposes. Furthermore, the ideas shaped within speeches given are mainly delivered by those who indicate powers which make political leaders play big role upon this contexts as the speakers. Power, at these levels, includes the capacity to control internally harmonized ideology or (at the societal level) with each other (Fairclough, 1989, p.30). Political leaders, at this rate, practice their speeches to convey certain intentional purposes which were to shape better nations or even world, representing today's issues, maintaining social relationships, offering new ideas

or creating impactful changes. One of the political leaders that exercises her power into speeches is United Kingdom's previous prime minister, Theresa May. May utters speeches to impose a hidden fashion of rational communication in between ideas and the proposed acts in relation to depict reflective things of such issue. Therefore, her speech must present some composed frces to to magnify her preferred belief systems as actions. However, her preferred belief systems as implied through her speeches have been showing changes as they differ to what she has as stance especially in Brexit referendum by the time she uttered her first major speech as prime minister compared to before she was chosen as the prime minister in which it makes May's speech worth to be investigated.

In this study, the researcher is eager to explore it elaborately through the study of context, pragmatics, that centralizes in speech act theory, in which it contributes Searle's classifications illucotionary acts to represent forces or intentional purposes created by Theresa May. By the perspectives of pragmatics, the situations described can progressively enable pictures of how acts are actually done and what forces as implied in intentions and purposes that remain true behind the making process by understanding the core of certain forces stored into words of May's speeches. Finally, this draws causal reference in between the speeches of May and the forces driven to be plausible to one another which are pragmatically relevant in order to be done.

Moreover, two questions are formulated in this study. First, it deals with the types of illocutionary acts employed in Theresa May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech; and second, it deals with the contexts underlying the illocutionary acts produced in the speech. The purposes of the study are to identify the types of illocutionary acts employed in Theresa May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech and to show the revelations of the contexts underlying the illocutionary acts produced in the speech. Theoretically, this research is able to be used to confirm the theory of contextual meaning in which purposes can be discovered through literature by the insight view of pragmatics approach, especially in the speech act theory. Practically, this research are expected to 1) give contributions as reference and materials that are used as courses with basis of linguistics and its pragmatics study that concerns speech acts analysis especially where illocutionary acts are composed; 2) improve the ability to know how speech act is done with the reflection of the analysis that is pragmatically related; 3) contribute to give understandings of how intentions and contexts underlying the actions performed by political leaders through their speeches.

B.   REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1.   Speech Acts

Austin (1962, p.8) explained how the uttering of words is the leading incident in the performance of the act which performance is the object of the utterance and what solely necessary is the act that is considered to have been performed. In other words, he defined speech acts as an utterance that brings about performative sentence. Searle developed the theory of speech acts into a

concept where language is a rule-governed form of behavior (1969, p.16-17). He suggested speech act contributes to linguistic communication as action is performed while uttering a language. Furthermore, Yule (1996, p.48) stated that any occasion involving a performed action by producing an utterance consists of three related acts, they are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Among the three acts related, illocutionary act is the most discussed dimension.

2.   Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary act as a part of speech acts divisions presents an act performed via utterance with a force to deliver purpose. Austin (1962, p.99) referred illocutionary act a great difference of the expressed forces thrown after the use of uttered language. He explained that for there are numerous functions and ways to use speech, there are also many sense and reference one can refer as intentions. In addition, Yan Huang (2014, p.128) defined illocutionary act as the type of function a speaker intends to fulfill or the type of function a speaker intends to accomplish in the course of producing an utterance. Additionally, to indicate what illocutionary force is acted via meaningful linguistic expression. Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (henceforth IFIDs). Accordingly, they involve several elements as identifications to name what illocutionary act is being performed. They are, at least, word order, stress, intonation contour, punctuation, the mood of the verb, and performative verbs (Searle, 1969, p.30). Furthermore, Searle (1969, p.12) presented the classifications of speech acts into five divisions. They are assertives, directives, commisives, expressives and declarations.

a.   Assertives

Assertive class is being defned by Searle as how the speaker commit to determine the truth of the propositional content in having his expressed degree as an assessment. The assesment mentioned refers to the state of characterizing the true and false dimensions (1969, p.18). Accordingly, this is by means that if the speaker determines his belief to be true or false, he is stating assertive illocutionary act.

b.   Directives

Searle (1969) explained directives as the type of speech acts that is derived after the attempts of the speaker to get the hearer to do something, be it an invitation, suggestion or even insistence. For instance, the speaker of directive speech acts directs the hearer to elicit actions.

c.   Commisives

Commisives' definition lays upon the point where the speaker commits some future action towards himself. Yule (1996) suggested that, at this type, commisives expressed by the speaker shows what he intends.

d.   Expressives

Expressive type of illocutionary act refers to the class where the speaker expresses their psychological state about the propositional content happening (Searle, 1969, p.15). The psychological state mentioned is specifically about the speaker's experience and it can be in a form of statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow (Yule, 1996, p.53).

e.   Declarations

Declaration is defined as how the propositional content within an utterance corresponds to the realilty. In short, declarations brings about changes in the condition of the objects referred (Searle, 1969, p.16-17). For instance, given an utterance of declaration where one perform an act of stating a war, then the war is on. However, constituting linguistic competence by the speaker and hearer is not sufficient to perform a successful declaration. Accordingly, Yule (1996, p.53) that in doing declaratives or declarations, the speaker has to have a special institutional role which also is in a specific context.

3.   Context

Searle (1969) suggested that illocutionary act as the act consisting characteristically in uttering words in sentences in certain contexts, under certain condition, and with certain intention. In regards to this, he said that in actual speech situations, the context will clearly indicate what illocutionary force is intended in an utterance without being necessarily invoke what is appropriate within the explicit illocutionary force indicator. In short, context holds significant role at determining what force is intended in the speaker's performed utterance as it can consider whether an utterance performing forces of purposes such as warning, promising, offering, and so forth.

Speaking of which, contexts refers to the situations in which we find ourselves in the actual circumstances of time and place and any relevant features of the situations taken. In other words, context is an abstract representation of a state of affairs that is conceived as relevant. Therefore, utterance can vary its meanings if the particular language take on situated or contextual meanings in a specific context. Furthermore, the sociolinguist Dell Hymes developed model of linguistics to mean words' use based on their contexts. The model belongs to SPEAKING model which are formed as the acronym of the first letters of speech components namely, Setting and Scene, Participants, Ends, Act Sequence, Key, Intruments, Norms and Genre.

a.   Setting and Scene

Hymes explained that "setting refers to the time and place, i.e., the concrete physical circumstances in which speech takes place. Scene refers to the abstract psychological setting, or the cultural definition of the occasion.

b.   Participants

Participants refer to the people involved in the communication. They "include various combinations of speaker–listener, addressor–addressee, or sender–receiver. They generally fill certain socially specified roles" (Wardaugh, 2006, p.247).

c.   Ends

Ends (E) "refers to the conventionally recognized and expected outcomes of an exchange as well as to the personal goals that participants seek to accomplish on particular occasions" (Wardaugh, 2006, p.247).

d.   Act Sequence

Act sequence (A) "refers to the actual form and content of what is said: the precise words used, how they are used, and the relationship of what is said to the actual topic at hand" (Wardaugh, 2006, p.248).

e.   Key

Hymes suggested Key as cues that establish "the tone, manner, or spirit in which a particular message is conveyed: light-hearted, serious, precise, pedantic, mocking, sarcastic, pompous, and so on" (Wardaugh, 2006, p.248).

f.   Instrumentalities

Instrumentalities (I) "refers to the choice of channel, e.g., oral, written, or telegraphic, and to the actual forms of speech employed, such as the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen" (Wardaugh, 2006, p.248).

g.   Norms

Norms of interaction and interpretation (N) refers to the social rules governing the speech situation as Hymes explained it as "specific behaviors and properties that attach to speaking and also to how these may be viewed by someone who does not share them, e.g., loudness, silence, gaze return, and so on" (Wardaugh, 2006, p.248).

h.   Genre

Genre "refers to clearly demarcated types of utterance; such things as poems, proverbs, riddles, sermons, prayers, lectures, and editorials" (Wardaugh, 2006, p.248).

C.   RESEARCH METHODS

Methodologically, the researcher decided on having a descriptive-qualitative methodology applied as the study is concerned with nonstatistical methods and small samples, often purposively selected (De Vos & Delport, 2011, p.65). Besides, content analysis study was used as the approach of this study as it was defined by Leedy and Ormrod (2001, p.155) as cited in Williams (2007, p.69) as "a detailed and systematic examination of the contents of a particular body of materials for the purpose of identifying patterns, themes, or biases". By two of these concepts as method and approach, they revealed the contexts attributed in the performed acts thus the researcher was able to do the study through analyses within certain contextual mattered.

The researcher supplied the data sources by the political speech namely *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech transcript published by United Kingdom's Goverment Official Website and YouTube downloaded from https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/britain-the-great-meritocracy-prime-ministers-speech and https://youtu.be/zFB44HWFmBs, both accessed on February 15, 2019. Besides, the data was gained by the speech itself through words, phrase and sentences counted as utterances said by Theresa May that were in relevance anything dealt with illocutionary act. Then, the data collection method was conducted through close-reading, speech-listening, to finally note-taking

techniques in regards to mark down whatever relevant to every indicated illocutionary acts and the contexts affecting the acts performed.

After that, the data analysis in this study was done based on the steps proposed by Robert K. Yin (2011) in which the researcher reviewed the data by a five-phased cycle, they were (1) compiling; where the data organized into categories of which data were necessarily influencing the research problems to be kept and which ones were not to be left behind, (2) disassembling; where the data collected and organized were selected to be reduced in order to be listed into smaller systematic classification of the types of illocutionary acts based on Searle's classifications of illocutionary acts that Theresa May's speech indicated along with the lingering contexts they carry. At this phase, certain data indicated relevant to the study were categorized by name of the classifications involving the set data needed to the study, (3) reassembling (and arraying); where the categorial data that included disassembled fragments of the previous phase were reorganized into different groupings and sequences in this reassembling phase. The fragments of the data of the previous phase were rearranged and recombined by their classification in this phase into the arrayed lists or to finally be seen in a broader sense, (4) interpreting; where the interpretations were pour down into analyses where the researcher give meanings to the data arranged by the interpretations that were based on Searle's classifications of illocutionary acts and the study of context that was explained by Hymes into SPEAKING (Situation, Participants, Ends, Act Sequence, Key, Instruments, Norms, Genre) formula to finally developed them into analyses over the interpretative data., and (5) concluding; where the lists of the data that became patterns show significance in the study by ways they indicated empirical interpretation based on the data found. The result of the analyses were formed into solid series of interpretative reference that make them connected to the preferred conclusion.

Finally, the researcher used data triangulation proposed by Denzin (1978, as cited in Hales 2010, p.14-17) to establish accuracy, validity and unbiased results of the data and to reduce the risk of false interpretation. The data triangulation mentioned was done by getting the data source not only by getting it from the speech transcript entitled *Britain, the great meritocracy* published by United Kingdom's government but also having YouTube video entitled Britiain, the great meritocracy: Prime Minister's speech published by 10 Downing Street, the official United Kingdom's government's YouTube channel.

D.   FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

1.   The Types of Illocutionary Acts Employed in Theresa May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* Speech

In *Britain, the great meritocracy* Speech, the researcher found four types of illocutionary acts employed in the speech. In total, 92 data were indicated as Theresa May's utterances that employed four types of illocutionary acts. Respectively, they were 54 assertive utterances, 20 directive utterances, 17 commissive utterances, and 1 expressive utterance. Additionally, one type of

illocutionary act that was not employed in the speech was declaration. Nevertheless, all categories of the data found were explained by each in the elaborative analysis characterized by Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) below.

a.   Assertives

Assertive type of illocutionary act is used to characterize someone's belief in true or false dimensions (Searle, 1979). By producing this act, the speakers intend to tell what they know or believe upon something. Accordingly, reporting was the first kind of force of the assertive illocutionary act found in Theresa May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* Speech. The data indicated was presented as follows.

Data A.4
"**This government's priorities are those of ordinary, working class people**" (Departement for Education, 2016).

The data displayed above was analyzed as indirect reporting illocutionary acts by considering the characteristics of IFIDs such as word order, stress, intonation, and mood of the verb. First, in terms of word order, the way the subject, verb and also object of the four data were structured to construct simple declarative sentences. Speaking of this, this supposed to be used in uttering statements. Second, the stress was hinged respectively upon the words 'priorities' in the Data A.4 to be put accentuation upon as indicating the focused propositional contents of the utterance. Third, the intonation contour heard were all in falling intonation as functioned to suggest a discourse function in which it was to give new information to the audience. Last, the use of auxiliary verbs of present continuous tense 'are' in the data implied a sense of reporting factual actions and conditions that was in line of how indicative mood was referred as. To elaborate, in order to be produced, reporting acts were consisted of two sorts of propositional contents which included things happened in respect to the past and present times (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). In this case, the data suggested that they were about the British governmental issues happening that day in the Data A.4 In consequence, May pointed them out of reporting illocutionary acts.

b.   Directives

Directives came as the second type of illocutionary act proposed by Searle (1979). Accordingly, he defined directives as the type of illocutionary act performed by the speaker to get the hearer eliciting actions and through these acts, the speaker intends to direct the hearer to do something (1979). In regards to the matter, Inviting was the first kind of force of directive illocutionary act found in the speech as displayed below.

Data D.14
"**Let's sweep away those barriers and encourage more people** to join us in the task of delivering a good school place for every child" (DFE, 2016).

Throughout the data shown above, the IFIDs that characterized the indirect illocutionary act of inviting were word order, stress, intonation contour and mood of the verb. To elaborate, the word order used was in the form of imperative sentence. Speaking of which, this was seen by the use of imperative sentence that started by a predicate of 'let' that was followed by 'us'. Other than that, this also indicated how a first person plural imperative was used to equal as inclusive object of 'us' to invite others in doing something. In addition, this was in line with the mood indicated to the verb 'let' which was imperative, as it functioned to give command or polite request towards the hearer. Then, the stresses hinged upon the words 'sweep' in Data D.14 suggested the place where May wanted to accentuate her word upon. After that, the intonation contour applied in all of the extracts was rise-fall intonation. As a result, it reflected the attitudinal function that consisted of an act of requesting; in which in this case dealt with the act of inviting.

c.   Commissives

The third type of illocutionary act proposed by Searle was commissives (1979). By definition, commissives was defined as the type of illocutionary act performed that was intended to make future action committed by the speaker (Searle, 1979). By performing the act, the speaker intended to do something in near future. Representing herself as a Prime Minister, May did the directive illocutionary act under 1 (one) force, that was promising. Indeed, the data would be displayed as follows.

Data C.3
"That is good and right – and **as long as I am Prime Minister, the pupil premium for the poorest children will remain**" (DFE, 2016).

Data C.3 was identified to imply the indirect commissive illocutionary act of promising because of the characteristics of IFIDs indicated. First, word order, as one kind of the IFIDs, was structured in the form of declarative sentence. This was to function as making statement. Second, the stress emphasized the word 'remain' accentuated to put the attention focusing towards the word. Third, the falling intonation used referred to how May had finalized her statement before uttering it out. Last, the mood of the verb 'will remain' depicted the subjunctive mood to suggest action which was contrary to the fact as it told how the future action was just about to be done by May as the speaker.

d.   Expressives

The fourth type of illocutionary act proposed by Searle (1979) was expressives. By definition, expressive illocutionary act referred to where the psychological state that related to the propositional content of was expressed by the speaker (Searle, 1979). The psychological state mentioned was the speaker's experience in which it could be statements of pleasure, dislikes, so on and so over. Regardingly, Theresa May in *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech used expressive type of illocutionary act once with the force of thanking.

Data E.1
"And **thanks to our reforms** that is increasingly the case" (DFE, 2016).

In this data, the IFID that characterized it to have the act of thanking or expressing the statement of gratitude was performative verb. To illustrate, the performative verb used was the verb of thanking indicated in the word 'thanks'. However, the word 'thanks' above was recognized to be attributed by the propositional content that dealt with statement of gratitude that reflected the speaker's psychological state. Through the utterance, she performed the act to deliver her feeling of how thankful she was towards the reforms.

2. The Contexts Underlying the Illocutionary Acts Employed in Theresa May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* Speech

In the speech, the researcher found that eight components of Hymes' SPEAKING model of contexts underlay the four types of illocutionary acts employed in the speech. The first 5 (five) components namely setting and scene, participants, key, instrumentalities, and norms affected Theresa May to produce illocutionary acts as a whole in her speech as they characterized May's standpoints; the other 2 (two) components namely act sequence and genre classified illocutionary act type as they respectively dealt with forms and contents of utterances and the name of the illocutionary act types found; and the remaining component, ends, underlay reasons that include purposes as represented in the illocutionary force employed within the illocutionary acts found. To elaborate, the analysis of the model applied to interpret the contexts of such illocutionary acts performed was presented as follows.

a. Assertives

Data A.4
"This government's priorities are those of ordinary, working class people" (DFE, 2016).

The **first speech component** of Hymes' SPEAKING model of context is **setting and scene**. As referred to the physical circumstances, reporting acts presented above was delivered in early autumn—a season away from when Theresa May had just been elected as Britain's new prime minister. In regards to the matter, the following data indicated the setting of time of the speech.

Data S.1
"When I stood in Downing Street as Prime Minister for the first time this summer, I set out my mission to build a country that works for everyone. **Today** I want to talk a little more about what that means and lay out my vision for a truly meritocratic Britain that puts the interests of ordinary, working class people first" (DFE, 2016).

As indicated, the word 'Today' referred to the fact that speech was taken that day which was on September 9, 2016. Additionally, May made her speech delivery of *Britain, the great meritocracy* in the British Academy, London— one of the United Kingdom's national academies and royal charters. As for the atmosphere, the scene was in a decent seriousness as it was May's first substantive speech ever since becoming a prime minister. As someone who was taken account of being responsible in leading governmental duties, May suggested her seriousness to build trusts and captivate attention to embody a figure of political leader of her country.

The **second component**, **participants** reflected that Theresa May was responsible as addressor with social roles that was prime minister and the audience as the addressees. Specifically, the audience split into several kinds of roles socially; they were students of the British Academy, London, government side of the house— such as staff of Department of Education and the prime minister's security guards—, press, and British nation that included low, working and high class of the society. As for the other hearers, they were press from other countries with the journalistic team that was not included as British nation as the speech was also published across the globe through mass media such as newspaper, news portal site, social media including YouTube and many other more.

Ends as the **third component** showed that the assertive illocutionary act with illocutionary force of reporting was done to assert with the propositional content condition which was occurred in the past or present times with respect to the moment (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). By means of which, this act enabled the speakers to purposefully speak out what happened in the past and present times of theirs towards the hearer. Through the reporting acts displayed above— opening the case of the context underlying illocutionary act produced, May, for instance, revealed Data A.4 to be governmental issues as they consisted of proposal's target and track record belonged to their own. In the Data A.4, she informed that ordinary, working class had been decided as government's priority to assist. This came after how they managed to have no complaint over the struggles they faced which was where the government determined to fill the gap by preferably place them into priority along the period of when their vision remained.

The **fourth component**, **act sequence** showed what she profoundly meant by that in terms of form and content. May started to utter her belief systems of what was at that time happening in Britain through speech acts that included assertive illocutionary act of reporting. As for the **key**, at this point, May had her political speech in a serious tone with considerably consequent manner. Then, the **sixth components**, **instrumentalities** suggested that May used English as her language in which she delivered the speech orally by reading the written transcript. Additionally, the style she used was a formal register. After that, **norms** as the **seventh component**, indicated that May involved neither interruption nor collaboration from the audience. Finally, **genre** as the **last component** showed that the kind of illocutionary act performed in the illocutionary act of reporting was assertive illocutionary act type.

b. **Directives**

Data D.14
"Let's sweep away those barriers and encourage more people to join us in the task of delivering a good school place for every child" (DFE, 2016).

The setting and scene, participants, key, instrumentalities, and norms of directive illocutionary act of inviting were as same as indicated in the assertive illocutionary act of reporting above. However, the act sequence in May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech contained of bringing about proposals as mission to elevate her vision to become real works and actions by uttering directive illocutionary act. By inviting act, May directed British nation to join her in reforming the school system together. Hence, the genre was directive illocutionary act type. Last, the ends component of SPEAKING model of context which underlay the inviting act was to influence the hearer to join certain agenda proposed by the speaker (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). Purposefully, the acts were performed to imprint what May had as preferences towards British people. In regards, this was made to incline burden to preserve better country starting by creating better nation. Thus, over the challenge in facing the changing Britain to be a great meritocracy, May depicted her preferences that might result better if it were contributed also by the roles of the nation by enacting the illocutionary act of inviting. Afterwards, she started to invite the people take parts in building school reform through the sense of togetherness in the Data D.14, in which she eventually encourage them to expand the school capacity into broader stretch of variety to finally cast away any barrier that declined them to grow further.

c. **Commissives**

Data C.3
"That is good and right – and as long as I am Prime Minister, the pupil premium for the poorest children **will remain**" (DFE, 2016).

The setting and scene, participants, key, instrumentalities, and norms of commissive illocutionary act of promising were as same as indicated in the assertive illocutionary act of reporting above. However, the act sequence in May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech was she committed to deliver better outcomes as her vision—which was to manage Britain as a meritocratic country that would work for everyone remained—by conducting the mission she set through commissive illocutionary acts. Hence, the genre was commissive illocutionary act type. Last, the ends component of SPEAKING model of context which underlay the promising act was to do something for the hearer's benefit and involve obligation as a special commitment of the speaker (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985, p.192). Right before May said her promise, she exactly pointed out her role in the country as the prime minister in a direct sense. With this role, she explicitly

guaranteed that no matter how widespread pros and cons varied, she would still give the poorest children the pupil premium to enjoy lives of their own. In accordance with the matter, this was said as promise to calm the children who worried about the necessities once they were attending schools without extra money to fulfill them daily. In conclusion, the promise attached in this extract was from May as the prime minister to the poorest children who were willing to attend schools.

d.   Expressives

Data E.1
"And **thanks** to our reforms that is increasingly the case" (DFE, 2016).

The setting and scene, participants, key, instrumentalities, and norms of expressive illocutionary act of thanking were as same as indicated in the assertive illocutionary act of reporting above. However, the act sequence contained in this act suggested May's gratitude towards the reform that was being endeavored. Thus, the genre of this illocutionary act was expressive illocutionary type. Then, the ends component of SPEAKING model of context which underlay the thanking illocutionary act was represented in the illocutionary force of thanking. Searle & Vanderveken (1985, p.215) said that "the point of thanking is to express gratitude. The preparatory conditions are that the thing in question benefits or is good for the speaker and the hearer us responsible for it". Speaking of which, this suggested how the speaker thanked the speaker by how a case was derived by the hearer and his relation rotating around the state of affairs specified in the preparatory conditions.

Purposefully, the expressive illocutionary act of thanking that stated the statement of gratitude reflected the speaker's psychological state. In the speech situation, she performed the act to deliver her feeling of how proud she was towards the reforms done by the contributions of the government and British people thus she thanked them. In return, this was actually in response to the previous notion which she guaranteed that children deserved opportunity to develop themselves academically. Hence, her gratitude was shown to give a depiction toward the audience that the reforms would work in succeeding the view of her visions. Nevertheless, the fact that there needed understanding in acknowledging that every child's potentials and needs differ to one another was put as the basis of her ends to recall back the gratitude May felt towards the schools reforms let alone the audience whom she thought should feel and be encouraged by it too by the expression she let out.

3.   Discussion
As found, the types of the illocutionary acts employed in Theresa May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* were assertives, directives, commissives and expressives. In the findings, there also found the contexts which underlay the types of the illocutionary acts produced. They were setting and scene, participants, ends,

act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms and genre. By the types of the illocutionary acts found, Theresa May performed them either by direct or indirect ways. Directly, she just performed the act of the type twice in the illocutionary act of assertive act by the force of believing and expressive act by the force of thanking. Otherwise, she remained the rests of the illocutionary act types performed indirectly. Theresa May preferred to perform the illocutionary acts in the indirect way instead of the direct one because she made the exercise of power through speech to create pervasive social interaction. By means of which, she implied that her power in influencing British nation through social interaction should be seen as an attempt to conduct social behavior of the political discourse as collocated to the idea that could be accepted in society and binding by the mass of citizens in which this was in line with what David Easton said as cited in Heywood (Heywood, 2013, p.10).

In order to deliver various political discourses considerably, May derived them through 13 (thirteen) indirect illocutionary forces found such as reporting, believing, informing, stating, affirming, assuring, inviting, asking, commanding, forbidding, advising, promising, and complaining. This was different from the previous study conducted by Kusumo entitled A Pragmatic Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in English Teaching-Learning Process at SMA N 1 Wates Kulon Progo. Although the illocutionary act type found on both studies were the same, the illocutionary forces remained different. For instance, illocutionary act with joking force was found in Kusumo's as her research dealt with illocutionary force conducted by teacher, therefore joking was considered to be performed by the speaker as to make the class more fun. Otherwise, it was not found in researcher's findings because May knew that as a prime minister, her authority once practiced in language could influence in a way or another hence she used it cautiously.

After that, *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech mostly consisted of assertive illocutionary act as it sufficed May's prominent purpose which was to show the stance of her belief systems that included various preferences and disfavors of hers upon Britain. Additionally, this was also by how declaration illocutionary act type was not found in the speech. Because although she had a special institutional role as a prime minister of United Kingdom, the social context wrapped around her intention remained as communicating substantive explanations of how Britain should be as a country along with the vision and missions to accomplish that as she had just been determined as the new prime minister of United Kingdom. Therefore, to fit in that specific context, May decided not to do any declaration in her speech. This was related to the previous study conducted by Saputro and Ismail which respectively entitled The Analysis of Illocutionary Acts Analysis of Jokowi's Speeches and The Study of Illocutionary Act: Jokowi's Campaign Speech On "Mewujudkan Jakarta Baru" where assertive act was also identified as the frequently performed one and there was no declaration illocutionary act type in the studies.

Moreover, the five components namely setting and scene, participants, key, instrumentalities, and norms in Hymes' SPEAKING model of contexts influenced Theresa May to employ illocutionary acts within her speech. This was because

these components characterized May's standpoints. Hence, this subsequently made May wanted to produce illocutionary act as a whole in her speech as the standpoints mentioned above were indicated as same throughout the speech. In addition, the other two components which were act sequence and genre, characterized as classifying the types of the illocutionary acts found as they respectively dealt with forms and content of utterances said as in the act sequence and what types of the illocutionary act type they were named after. As bigger pictures, these concepts were in reference with how interpreting contexts particularly vary in several processes through the study of pragmatics as language in use, context enables meaning interpretations to derive in the utterances expressed on a given occasion (Bach, 2006). Furthermore, the last component, ends, affected the reasons of why the illocutionary acts found were produced by each. By characteristics, the ends component as the goal defined the communicative purposes through the illocutionary force employed by the speaker. In accordance with the matter, this was in line with what Yule (1996) said how illocutionary force is some kind of functional mind in order to deliver such communicative purpose. In conclusion, the ends component represented the contexts underlying each illocutionary acts produced by Theresa May as the speaker.

E.   CONCLUSIONS

First, the types of illocutionary acts employed in Theresa May's *Britain, the great meritocracy* speech were assertives, directives, commisives, and expressives. Further, assertives came as the most frequently performed illocutionary act type because it sufficed May's prominent purpose which was to show the stance of her belief systems. Besides, declarative type was not found throughout the study because of the specific social context that wrapped around her initial purpose was to communicate substantive information that included vision and missions of how Britain as country should be within the term of her being a new prime minister of United Kingdom. Second, the researcher found that all components of Hymes' SPEAKING model of contexts namely setting and scene, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms and genre underlay the illocutionary acts produced.

REFERENCES

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press

Bach, K. (2006). Pragmatics and semantics. In Horn, H. R & Ward, G. (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (1st ed., pp. 463-487). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd

De Vos, A.S & Delport. (2005). *Scientific theory and professional research*. Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York, United States of America: Longman

Hales, D. (2010). *An introduction to triangulation*. Ganeva, Switzerland: UNAIDS Organization

Heywood, A. (2013). *Politics.* London, United Kingdom: Red Globe Press

Horn, H. R & Ward, G. (Ed(s).). (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). New York, United States: Oxford University Press

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language.* London, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning.* Cambridge, United States of America: Cambridge University Press

Searle, J & Vanderveken D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Wardaugh, R. (2006). *An introductions to sociolinguistics.* Victoria, Australia: Blackwell Publishing

William, C. (2007). Research Methods. *Journal of Business and Economic Research*, *5*(3), 65-72

Yin, R.K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York, United States of America: The Guilford Press

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press