

ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS FOUND IN LITTLE WOMEN MOVIE SCRIPT

Ni Nyoman Arisma Duniary
Universitas Warmadewa
arismaduniary@gmail.com

Kuntayuni
Universitas Warmadewa
kuntayuni@warmadewa.ac.id

I Wayan Budiarta
Universitas Warmadewa
iw.budiarta@warmadewa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on illocutionary act found in *Little Women Movie Script*. In this research, the data is taken from the Little Women movie script. Two main theories are used for this study. The first theory is pragmatic theory from George Yule (1996). The second theory is the function of the illocutionary act theory as explained by Leech (1983) in the book entitled *"Principles of Pragmatics"*. The methods of this research are divided into four steps, they are finding or deciding the data source, collecting the data, analysing the data, and presenting the data. The data is collected by reading the movie script several times and underlining or marking the illocutionary acts that are found in the movie script. After that, the data is classified based on the various types and functions of illocutionary acts. Furthermore, the data is also analysed using Yule's points of view in pragmatic. In presenting the data, descriptive research is used in this research. Based on the analysis, the types of illocutionary acts that are found in the Little Women movie script are declaration, representative, expressive, directive, and commissive. Meanwhile, the functions of the illocutionary act that are found in the movie script are competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive.

Keywords: functions; illocutionary act; movie script; types

INTRODUCTION

Language influences every aspect of our lives since it gives our ideas voice and allows us to communicate our emotions (Dawson and Phelan, 2016). Language is also a communication tool which should be understood by the interlocutors.

According to (Yule, 1996) it is said that pragmatics is the study of meaning that is conveyed by a speaker (or writer) and perceived by a listener (or reader). It means that when having a conversation, the listener (reader) analyses what the speaker (writer) intends to convey when they speak or write. Speech act is one of the topics that is discussed in pragmatics. Speech act is performing act of speaking. Speech act focuses on how the hearer analyses

and responds to the utterance that is spoken by the speaker.

According to (Tutuarima, Nuraeningsih, and Rusiana, 2018) they said that speech act is significant for all of us. By studying speech act people can understand what messages are found in each utterance. It means that by learning different types of speech acts the speaker and the hearer can avoid misunderstandings and they can have good communication. Speech act is commonly used in daily life conversation.

According to (Austin, 1962), he distinguished speech act into three acts, namely locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. A locutionary act is an utterance that is spoken by the speaker to the hearer. Illocutionary act is the real meaning of

an utterance that is spoken by the speaker. Meanwhile, perlocutionary act is the effect of an utterance that is spoken by the speaker. This research is concentrated on illocutionary act because it is interesting to analyse the meaning of the phrase that is spoken by the speaker. Every utterance contains a literal meaning or a hidden meaning. Speakers will always have an intention when uttering something. Therefore, by analysing illocutionary acts everyone can communicate effectively with each other, and the hearer can interpret the meaning of the phrase that is uttered by the speaker.

This study analyses illocutionary act found in Little Women movie script by Greta Gerwig (Alcott et al., 2020). The movie script is chosen because every utterance that is uttered by every character in the movie has been written in the movie script and it can be copied directly to the research, so it can save the research time. If the data source uses movie, every utterance that contains an illocutionary act needs to be rewritten, and it will take too much time. This research used two main theories. The first theory is the speech act theory from George Yule in his book named Pragmatics (1996) (Yule, 1996). The second theory is the function of speech act from Leech in the entitled book Principles of Pragmatics (1983) (Leech, 1983). These two main theories are chosen because they give a detailed explanation of speech acts, especially type illocutionary act and function of illocutionary act. Moreover, the explanations that are given by these researchers are also easy to understand.

The specific aim of this research is to find out the types of illocutionary acts found in the Little Women movie script. The other specific aim of this research is to analyse the functions of each type of illocutionary act found in the Little Women movie script written by Greta Gerwig.

METHOD

The method of this research is divided into four steps: finding or deciding the data source, collecting the data, analysing the data, and presenting the data.

The data source of this research is taken from the movie script of Little Women written by Greta Gerwig. This movie is adapted from the Little Women novel written by Louisa May

Alcott. Little Women movie can be watched on Netflix. The genres of this movie are romance and drama. This movie was chosen because there are a lot of illocutionary acts that are found in the movie. In addition, the writer has access to watch this movie on Netflix, and the writer's interest in movies makes it easier to understand the utterances or the meaning in the utterances.

As the first step of collecting the data, the script of Little Women read several times. The second step is to underline or mark the types of illocutionary acts that are found in the movie script. The third step is categorizing the various types and functions of illocutionary acts found in the script of Little Women.

After data is classified, a qualitative method is used to analyse the data. A qualitative method is a method that uses words as the data and then analysed using words or theories with a lot of sources. The qualitative method is used in this research because the aim of this research is to analyse types of illocutionary act and their functions in the Little Women movie script by using theories. George Yule's theory of speech acts is used in analysing the types of illocutionary act and the function of speech act theory, which is proposed by Leech is also used to analyse the function of illocutionary act. Besides those two theories, this research is also supported by other theories.

In this research, descriptive research is also used. Descriptive research is used in this research to answer the "what" question in scope of discussion and to describe the data. It is because descriptive research can answer what, where, and when questions (McNeill and Chapman, 2005).

DISCUSSION

In this research all types and functions of illocutionary act are found. Those types of illocutionary acts are declaration, representative, expressive, directive, and commissive. The functions of illocutionary acts are competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive. The detailed explanation of each data is elaborated below.

(1) Declaration

Based on the theoretical framework chapter, declaration is used to declare statements that can change the hearer's world via speaker's utterance. In this case, the speaker

must have an institutional role to perform this type of illocutionary act.

Data 1

Hannah : "What is it?"

Doctor : "**It's scarlet fever.**" (Page: 83)

The conversation is taken from the flashback scene when Beth was sick, and her family called a doctor. Then, the doctor examined Beth. He declared that Beth had scarlet fever.

Based on a pragmatic point of view, the conversation above can be analysed based on four points. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Hannah said, "What is it?" it means she asked about Beth's condition. Then, the doctor said, "It's scarlet fever." It can be concluded that scarlet fever is a disease because the doctor replied to Hannah's question about Beth's condition.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is Beth's condition. It can be seen when Hannah said, "What is it?" The doctor instantly understood Hannah's question because they both knew the context. That is why the doctor replied to Hannah's question by saying "It's scarlet fever" which refers to Beth's condition after the doctor checked on her. Third, how it gets more communicated than it is said. When Hannah just said, "What is it?" the doctor immediately said, "It's scarlet fever." It means, even though Hannah just said a short utterance and she did not make her point clear, the doctor still understood her utterance since they both knew the context, so it gets more communicated.

Fourth, the expression of relative distance. The expression of relative distance in this conversation can be seen when the doctor declares and reports Beth's condition by saying "It's scarlet fever." People who can declare other people's conditions are usually called doctor. So, it can be concluded that the relationship between Hannah and the doctor is as a doctor and a patient's family.

The four points of view from George Yule above can be used to analyse the types of illocutionary acts that exist in the dialogue above. The bold utterance can be classified as a declaration because according to the Cambridge Dictionary, a declaration is an official or public statement about something. In this case, the doctor as the speaker made an official statement that Beth has scarlet fever.

Moreover, to make an appropriate declaration, the speaker has to have an institutional role. In this conversation, the speaker has an institutional role as a doctor. It means that the speaker is an expert in the field of health. So, he can diagnose Beth's disease and declare that she has scarlet fever. Additionally, the bold utterance that is uttered by the doctor changes the world of the hearer. It made the hearer sad and confused at the same time.

The bold utterance above had a collaborative function because the doctor as the speaker declared or reported his diagnosis of Beth's disease to Hannah. He said that Beth has a scarlet disease. So, it is obvious that the utterance "It's scarlet fever" that is uttered by the doctor had a collaborative function because reporting includes a collaborative function. Besides that, in this case, the doctor as the speaker also ignored the social goals because he/she reported his/her diagnosis to Hannah, and Hannah as the hearer could not justify whether the doctor's statement was true or not.

Data 2

Doctor : "Have you all had it before?"

Jo : "Meg and I have, but Amy hasn't!"

Doctor : "**She'll have to be sent away.**"

Amy : "I don't want to be sent away!"

(Page: 83)

The conversation above was taken from the flashback scene when Beth got sick, and the doctor diagnosed her with scarlet fever. The bold utterance was performed by a doctor. He declared that Amy must be sent away to prevent her from catching scarlet fever because she had never had it before.

The conversation above can be analysed based on three points of view from Yule. First, the meaning of the speaker. When the doctor said, "Have you all had it before?" It means the doctor asked the patient's family whether the patient's family had scarlet fever before and Jo as the hearer replied that Meg and she had it but Amy had not. Then the doctor said, "She'll have to be sent away." By uttering this sentence, the doctor also implicitly asserted that scarlet fever was a contagious disease, therefore the doctor informed or asserted the patient's family that Amy must be sent away to protect her from scarlet fever, but Amy did not want to be sent away.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is how to prevent

Amy from getting scarlet fever. It can be seen when Jo said that Amy has never had scarlet fever before, then the doctor said, "She'll have to be sent away."

Third, the expression of relative distance. The expression of relative distance in this conversation is when the doctor said, "She'll have to be sent away." This sentence is used to protect Amy from scarlet fever because scarlet fever is a contagious disease. Someone who can decide whether the disease is contagious or not is usually called a doctor. So, it can be concluded that the relationship between the speaker in this conversation is a doctor and a patient's family.

Based on Yule's point of view, the bold utterance can be classified as a declaration. In this case, the doctor as the speaker made an official statement that Amy has to be sent away. Besides that, the speaker who said the bold utterance has an institutional role as a doctor who is an expert on the issue. Additionally, the bold utterance that is uttered by the doctor changes the world of the hearer. It made the hearer sad, confused, and angry at the same time. So, it is obvious that the bold utterance can be classified as a declaration.

The bold utterance above had a collaborative function because the doctor as the speaker declared and asserted that scarlet fever is contagious disease in an implicit way. It is obvious that the bold utterance above had a collaborative function because asserting includes a collaborative function. Besides that, this utterance has a collaborative function because the speaker in this function ignores social goals. The doctor, as the speaker just implicitly asserted that scarlet fever is a contagious disease and Amy had to be sent away and the patient's family as the hearer could not justify whether the doctor statement is true or not.

(2) Representative

Based on the theoretical framework chapter, representative is used to state what the speaker believes. They are description, conclusion, and assertion.

Data 3

Aunt March : "The decadents have ruined Paris, if you ask me. These French women couldn't lift a hairbrush."
No response from Amy.

Aunt March : "AMY! I said, "These French women couldn't lift a hairbrush."

Amy : "Oh yes! Very true, Aunt March." (Page: 6)

This data is taken from the scene when Amy and Aunt March were in Paris, and they rode in an open-air carriage. Everyone in Paris was out, and then Aunt March said, "These French women could not lift a hairbrush." She said it twice because at first Amy didn't give any response.

Based on a pragmatic point of view, the conversation above can be analysed based on two points. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Aunt March said, "These French women couldn't lift a hairbrush." She means that the French women are weak and at first, Amy as the hearer did not give any response. So, Aunt March said it again and Amy replied to Aunt March's utterance by saying "Oh yes! Very true, Aunt March." She said these words because she did not want to make Aunt March angry.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is when Aunt March saw French Women, she believed that French women are weak. It can be seen when Aunt March said, "These French women couldn't lift a hairbrush."

Based on those two points, it can be concluded that the bold utterance above is a representative because Aunt March as the speaker asserted her utterances by saying the bold utterance to make Amy respond to her utterance. Asserting includes representative so, it is obvious that the bold utterance can be classified as representative. Moreover, representative is used to states what the speaker believes. In this case, Aunt March, as the speaker stated what she believed through the bold utterance. The bold utterance means that Aunt March believed that French women are weak.

The bold utterance in the conversation above had a collaborative function. It can be seen when at first Amy as the speaker did not give any response to Aunt March's utterance, so Aunt March asserted her statement twice to make Amy respond to her statement. The meaning of the bold utterance is Aunt March believed that French women were weak. So, it is obvious that the bold utterance above had a

collaborative function because asserting includes a collaborative function. Furthermore, the bold utterance that is uttered by Aunt March ignores social goals because Aunt March asserted her statement based on what she believed, and Amy as the hearer cannot justify whether Aunt March's statement is true or not.

Data 4

Laurie : "There is a girl out there."
Mr. Brooke : "No, there is not."
Laurie : "**YES! Mr. Brooke, there is a girl!**" (Page: 41)

The conversation above was taken from a flashback scene when Laurie and the March sisters were still young and he still needed to study with his tutor, Mr. Brooke. The bold utterance was performed by Laurie. He believed that there was a girl out there, but Mr. Brooke did not believe him.

The conversation above can be analysed based on two points. These points are from Yule's point of view. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Laurie said "There's a girl out there" it means he saw a girl in front of his house. Then, Mr. Brooke said "No, there is not." It means Mr. Brooke did not believe Laurie. He taught Laurie just wanted to trick him because he knew Laurie did not like studying. So, Laurie asserted his utterance to Mr. Brooke by saying "YES! Mr. Brooke, there is a girl!" to make Mr. Brooke believe him.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is the existence of a girl in front of Laurie's house. It can be seen when Laurie said, "There's a girl out there."

From these explanations, it can be concluded that the bold phrase can be classified as representative because representative is used to states what the speaker believes. So, it is obvious that the bold utterance above is representative. In addition, when Mr. Brooke did not believe Laurie, Laurie asserted what he believed to Mr. Brooke by saying, "YES! Mr. Brooke, there is a girl!" Asserting includes representative.

The bold utterance in the conversation above had a collaborative function because Laurie as the speaker asserted his statement to Mr. Brooke because at first Mr. Broke did not believe Laurie. So, he asserted his statement by saying "YES! Mr. Brooke, there is a girl!" It is clear that the bold utterance that was uttered by Laurie had a collaborative function because

asserting includes a collaborative function. Besides that, Laurie as the speaker also ignored the social goals because he asserted what he believed, even if Mr. Brooke as the hearer did not believe him.

(3) Expressive

Based on the theoretical framework chapter, expressive can be used to state what the speaker feels. It can express pleasure, like, dislike, pain, sorrow, and joy. It can also include thanking, apologizing, welcoming, and congratulating.

Data 5

Jo : "Hello!"
Hannah : "**Thank God you're home!**"
(Page: 47)

This conversation is taken from the scene when Jo comes back home after reading a telegram from Marmee (Jo's mam). In the telegram, Marmee said that Beth had taken a turn for the worse, and she asked Jo to come home immediately. After reading it, Jo immediately went back home. After Jo got home, she was surrounded by Marmee, Meg, Hannah, Demi, Daisy. Jo greeted them, and Hannah said, "Thank God you're home!"

The conversation above can be analysed based on two points from a pragmatic point of view. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Hannah said, "Thank God you're home!" her utterance means that Hannah felt so grateful because Jo was already home and could accompany Beth.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is Hannah being happy because she knows Jo will accompany Beth. It can be seen when Marmee said "Thank God you're home!"

From these points of view, the bold utterance above can be classified as an expressive because Hannah as the speaker stated what she feels. She felt so happy and relieved after Jo came back home by saying the bold utterance above. So, she immediately thanking God to show her happiness and gratitude. As explained about the definition of expressive, the bold utterance can be classified as expressive because thanking included an expressive.

The bold utterance in the conversation above has a convivial function because Hannah (the housekeeper of March family) as the speaker showed her gratitude by thanking God

because Jo is already home. It is clear that the bold utterance has a convivial function because thanking includes a convivial function, and it can create a good relationship with society. In this case, the utterance "Thank God you're home!" provides positive politeness and can create a good relationship between Hannah and Jo.

Data 6

Meg : "It is a good thing that it is still tonight, then. Do you like the way I look?"
Laurie : "No I don't."
Meg : "Why not?"
Laurie : "I don't like fuss and feathers."
Meg : "**You ... you are the rudest boy I ever saw!**" (Page: 63)

The conversation above is taken from the scene when Meg asked Laurie did Laurie liked her look, and Laurie said he did not like it because of the fuss and feathers. Meg felt sad and offended after hearing Laurie's opinion, and she said the bold utterance.

Based on a pragmatic point of view, the conversation above can be analysed based on two points. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Meg asked Laurie about her look, Laurie said he did not like it and then Meg said "You...you are the rudest boy I ever saw!" It means Meg was angry toward Laurie because Laurie said his opinion without caring about Meg's feelings, that is why Meg said that Laurie is the rudest boy.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is Laurie said his opinion about Meg's look and ignored Meg's feelings which made Meg angry. It can be seen when Meg said "You...you are the rudest boy I ever saw!"

From these explanations, the bold utterance above can be classified as an expressive because Meg as the speaker stated what she felt. She felt sad and offended when she heard Laurie's opinion of her look. She expressed her pain by saying that Laurie is the rudest boy. As explained about the definition of expressive, the bold utterance can be classified as expressive because pain includes an expressive.

The bold utterance in the conversation above had a conflictive function. It can be seen when Meg asked Laurie about her look, and Laurie said he did not like it. It made Meg sad and frustrated. Therefore, she cursed Laurie by

calling Laurie the rudest boy she ever saw. So, it is obvious that the bold utterance above had a conflictive function because cursing includes a conflictive function. Moreover, a conflictive function is also used to insult and hurt the hearer's feelings. In this case, by saying, "You...you are the rudest boy I ever saw!" Meg wanted to insult Laurie and hurt his feelings because Laurie gave a bad opinion of Meg's looks.

(4) **Directive**

Based on the theoretical framework chapter, directives are used to make other people do something. They are command, order, request, suggestion.

Data 7

Amy : "**Come to the New Year's Party! It's a ball and everyone will be there, including Fred. Pick me up at the hotel at eight - the Chavain! Dress for festivities! Top hats and silks!**"
Laurie : "I will! I will wear my best silk!" (Page: 8)

This dialogue is taken from scene when Amy met Laurie in Paris. Amy, as the speaker requested Laurie to come to the party by saying the bold utterance.

Based on a pragmatic point of view from George Yule, the conversation above can be analysed based on two points. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Amy invited Laurie to the party Laurie said "I will! I will wear my best silk!" It means Laurie will come to the party and he will wear his best silk.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is Laurie accepted Amy's invitation. It can be seen when Laurie said "I will! I will wear my best silk!"

From these explanations, it is obvious that the bold utterance above can be classified as a directive because Amy made someone else do something. In this situation, she wants Laurie to come to the Party, therefore, she made a request about it. Therefore, it is obvious that bold utterance can be classified as a directive because requesting includes a directive.

The bold utterance above had a convivial function because Amy, as the speaker requested/invited Laurie to the party in Paris. So, it is obvious that the bold utterance above had a convivial function because inviting includes a convivial function. Besides that, the

bold utterance also showed Amy's politeness and attitude toward her friendship with Laurie. She respected their friendship, so she invited him to the party when she met him in Paris. The bold utterance above can also create a better relationship between Amy and Laurie.

Data 8

Amy : "LAURIE. STOP STANDING THERE AND GO GET THE HORSES READY."

Laurie : "Yes, my love." (Page: 115)

The conversation above is taken from the scene when Friedrich (Jo's New York friend) came to the March sisters' house and met Jo's family. They talked for hours, especially Jo's father and Friedrich. They talked about philosophy, religion, and politics. Jo's father obviously liked Friedrich. After talking for hours, Friedrich must go to California because he has been offered a professorate there and he has nothing to keep him in Concord. Amy, who heard it, took it as a code for Jo to keep Friedrich in Concord. Therefore, Amy asked Jo to chase Friedrich and ordered Laurie to get the horses.

Based on a pragmatic point of view, the conversation above can be analysed based on three points. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Amy said the bold utterance, it means that Amy ordered Laurie to get the horses ready as soon as possible to take Jo to meet Friedrich and Laurie replied by saying "Yes, my love" it means Laurie willing to do what Amy told.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is Laurie prepared the horses to take Jo to meet Friedrich. It can be seen when Amy ordered Laurie to get the horse ready and Laurie said "Yes, my love."

Third, the expression of relative distance. The expression of relative distance in this conversation can be seen when Laurie said "Yes, my love." It showed the relationship between Amy and Laurie. Their relationship is a wife and a husband. That is why when Amy told Laurie to prepare the horses Laurie immediately agreed and called Amy "my love".

From these points of view, it is obvious that the bold utterance above can be classified as a directive because Amy as the speaker wanted Laurie to do something. In this case, Amy ordered Laurie to get the horses ready by saying a bold utterance. So, it is clear that the bold

utterance can be classified as a directive because ordering includes a directive.

The bold utterance in the conversation above had a competitive function because Amy as the speaker ordered Laurie to get the horses as soon as possible. It is obvious that the bold utterance above had a competitive function because ordering includes a competitive function. In competitive function, the speaker also only focuses on their goals. The bold utterance that is uttered by Amy showed that Amy only focused on her aim to make Laurie get the horses ready without considering Laurie's willingness.

(5) Commissive

Based on the theoretical framework chapter, commissive is used to commit the speaker to some future actions. They are pledge, refusal, threat, promise, and offer.

Data 9

Jo : "What do you - that is, what compensation-"

Mr. Dashwood : "We pay twenty-five to thirty for things of this sort. We'll pay twenty for that."

Jo : "You can have it. Make the edits." (Page: 2)

The conversation above is taken from the scene when Jo offered her work to Mr. Dashwood, but he told Mr. Dashwood that it was not her work but her friend's work. After Mr. Dashwood read her work and said he would take Jo's work, Jo asked about compensation. Mr. Dashwood said, "We pay twenty-five to thirty for things of this sort. We'll pay twenty for that."

Based on George Yule's point of view of pragmatic, the conversation above can be analysed based on four points. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Jo said "What do you - that is, what compensation-" it means Jo asked about the compensation for her work and Mr. Dashwood said he will pay twenty for Jo's work.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is the compensation for Jo's work. It can be seen when Jo asked about compensation for her work Mr. Dashwood said the bold phrase.

Third, how it gets more communicated than it is said. When Jo just said "What do you - that is, what compensation-" Mr. Dashwood

instantly understood Jo's utterance even though she did not say her utterance clearly. From these explanations, it can be concluded that even though Jo just said a short utterance Mr. Dashwood still can understand it because she said it based on the context, so it gets more communicated.

Fourth, the expression of relative distance. The expression of relative distance in this conversation can be seen when Jo said, "What do you - that is, what compensation-" It shows that they are a business partner because they talked about the compensation of Jo's work.

From the explanation of Yule's point of view above, it can be concluded that the bold utterance is clearly commissive because Mr. Dashwood, as the speaker, committed himself to some future action by offering Jo compensation. Besides that, offering includes a commissive. So, it can conclude that bold utterance is commissive.

The bold utterance in the conversation above had a convivial function because Mr. Dashwood, as the speaker, offered twenty dollars for Jo's work when Jo asked him about the compensation. So, it is obvious that the bold utterance above had convivial function because offering includes a convivial function. Besides that, the convivial function is also associated with positive politeness, it can be seen in the bold utterance. The bold utterance above showed Mr. Dashwood's politeness and attitude toward Jo's work, and it can create a good relationship between Jo and Mr. Dashwood.

Data 10

Amy : "I will pay for myself!"
Jo : "You will not come."
Meg : "I'm sorry, my sweet, but Jo is right. Next time."
Jo : "Come, Meg, stop petting her!"
Amy : "**You will be sorry for this Jo March! You will! You will regret this!**" (Page: 50)

The utterance above is taken from the flashback scene when Meg and Jo will go to the theater with Laurie and Mr. Brooke. Amy wants to go with them, but Jo rejects her because Amy was not invited. Amy got angry and said the bold phrase above.

The conversation above can be analysed based on two points from Yule. First, the meaning of the speaker. When Amy said, "I'll

pay for myself." It means she would pay by herself to come to the theater with her sisters. Even though she said that she would pay for herself, her sisters still did not let Amy come to the theatre with them. Then, Amy got angry and said the bold utterance above. Amy's utterance means that she will do something to make Jo regret her decision not to let Amy come to the theater.

Second, the contextual meaning. The context of this conversation is Amy is not allowed to come to the theater by her sisters. It can be seen when Amy said, "I will pay for myself!" and then Jo replied by saying "You will not come."

Based on the points above, the bold utterance can be classified as a commissive because Amy as the speaker committed himself to some future action by threatening Jo. Amy said she would make Jo regret her decision. Besides that, threatening includes a commissive. So, it is obvious that bold utterance is commissive.

The bold utterance in the conversation above had a conflictive function because Amy as the speaker threatened Jo when Amy asked to come to the theatre with Jo, Meg, and Laurie, but Jo did not want Amy to go with them because Amy was not invited. Amy was angry with Jo, and she threatened Jo by saying the bold utterance above. The meaning of these words is that Amy will be doing something that will make Jo feel sorry and regret her decision not to let Amy go with them. So, it is obvious that the bold utterance above had a conflictive function because threatening includes a conflictive function. Furthermore, a conflictive function is also used to insult and hurt the hearer's feelings. In this case, by saying the bold utterance, Amy wanted to let Jo know that she would do something that would hurt Jo's feelings because Jo did not let Amy go to the theatre with them.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis in the previous chapter on illocutionary act, there are five types of illocutionary act found in Little Women movie script. Those five types of illocutionary are declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

There are 144 data of the types of illocutionary act that is found in the movie script of Little Women. Two data are classified as declarative, 20 data are classified as representative, 37 data are classified as expressive, 59 data are classified as directive, and 26 data are classified as commissive. The type of illocutionary act that is frequently used in Little Women movie script is directive. It is because the characters in Little Women (2019) frequently utters an utterance which made someone else to do something.

In the movie script of Little Women there are four functions of illocutionary act that is analysed in the previous chapter. Those functions are competitive, convivial, collaborative, and conflictive.

From 144 data of the types of illocutionary act that are found in the movie script of Little Women, there are 57 data have competitive function, 48 data have convivial function, 32 data have collaborative function, seven data have conflictive function. The most dominant function that is found in the data is competitive. Since the characters in this movie only focused on achieving their aims.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dawson, H. C., & Phelan, M. (2016). *Language Files: Materials for an Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Alcott, L. M., Gerwig, G., Pascal, A., Di Novi, D., Swicord, R., Le Saux, Y., Desplat, A., Ronan, S., Watson, E., Pugh, F., Scanlen, E., Dern, L., Chalamet, T., & Streep, M. (2020). *Little women*. [Culver City, California], Sony Pictures Home Entertainment.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatic*. London: Longman Linguistics Library.
- Mcneill, P., & Chapman, S. (2005). *Research Method*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tutuarima, Z., Nuraeningsih, & Rusiana. (2018). An Analysis of Speech Act Used in London Has Fallen Movie . *JOURNAL FOR LANGUAGE AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING*, 2018 VOL.7, NO.2, 160-169 , 123.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.