

Analyzing the Illocutionary Acts of the Main Character in 'The Woman in the Window' Film

Romano¹

¹Universitas Pamulang
¹Email: romanoasking@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to find and analyze the various types of illocutionary acts in utterances of the main character in the movie and also analyze the purposes of each of them. The object of this study is a movie titled "The Woman in The Window" by Joe Wright. This study uses a qualitative descriptive approach and theory from Searle (1976) to explain the data found. The data from this study is taken from the utterances spoken by the main character in the movie. Listing, observing and classifying were used as data collection methods to conduct this study. The conclusion of this research shows that there are 4 out of 5 types of illocutionary speech acts in speech used by the main character including their purposes in the movie. The types of illocutionary acts found were assertives (18 data), directive (16 data), expressives (1 data), and commissives (1 data). These four types of illocutionary have their own purposes in each utterance. For the most used types of illocutionary acts, the main character used assertives in form of concluding, stating, and complaining because she often wanted to convince other characters. When the main character attempted to solve the case on her own, she sometimes used directives in the form of asking, requesting, ordering, commanding, and begging in order to make other characters do something for her. She also used expressives in the form of apologizing, disliking, and thanking to express her feelings. The last the main character once used commissives in form of making a duty to herself when she was alone.

Keywords: *illocution, movie, pragmatic, speech act, utterance.*

A. Introduction

In general, pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that concerns to the utterances. Pragmatics shows how language has been used within a context and in particular ways (Richard & Schmidt, 2002). This term examines how people affect the ways when language is used to make various functions and intended purposes, it can be giving and asking for the information or asking for help. It means that speakers not only make utterances in communication but they also perform actions through the utterances. When people talk, they are doing things with their words since language is used not only to explain words but also to conduct an action that has a purpose and impact on the listener. For instance, “. In pragmatics, this term is called speech acts.

The result of this study will be expected to give more information to the readers about a language phenomenon called illocutionary acts. For society, this study will be expected to show that every person can do an illocutionary act, even the person who has agoraphobic and in underside effect of the medicine. The thing that the speaker aims to perform an action which uttering something is called an illocutionary act (Searle, 1976). It will also be expected to help people who are interested in linguistic to know how to analyze and classify illocutionary acts of the utterances in movies. As the reference, this study will be expected to become a reference for other researchers who want to conduct a study that focuses on speech acts, especially illocutionary acts.

The first study is titled “Speech acts analysis of status updates on Facebook: The case of Ghanaian university students” written by Nartey (2013). To find the various speech acts from Ghanaian university students’ Facebook statuses, he combined two theories. The First theory is the speech acts theories from Austin (1970) and Searle (1969). The second theory is from Waschauer and Herring’s notion of computer-mediated communication and used descriptive quantitative method as the research methodology. He collected the data by screenshotting several statuses from Facebook as much as he can. After collecting and analyzing some Facebook statuses updated by Ghanaian university students, he found five speech acts categories in the form of assertives (14), directives (21), expressives (13), commissives (5), and declarations (0) and the prominent categories were directives and assertives. In this point, the writer provided the explanation about the subject and topic which chosen to conduct this study. There are pragmatics, speech acts and its classifications and a little introduction about agoraphobia. The explanations of those were taken from several experts and also the conclusion of the writer in each point.

In general, pragmatics is the study of the meaning delivered through utterances. Pragmatics is a study about meanings that we do not know or how we can find out what someone wants when the word is spoken, not spoken, or even written. According to Mey (2001), Pragmatics is also the study of the condition of human language that is determined by the context of society. Pragmatics is the study of how people build meaning in different situations. It is the study of speaker meaning, the study of contextual meaning, the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and the study of the expression of relative distance (Yule, 2010). When people communicate, they can use their intended meanings, assumptions, aims or goals, and the kind of behaviors that they are performing.

As its name, speech acts is a study that focuses on speech and act or action. As stated by Yule (2010), speech act is an action done via the utterance by the speaker. Therefore, speech acts focus on the use of language and concern about how someone expresses something like promising, thanking, requesting, and apologizing. It means that when people tell something, they also do something or want the interlocutor to do something. According to Searle (1976), speech acts are the basic or the minimal units of linguistics communication. That means an utterance and the total in which the utterance is issued are both referred to as speech acts.

Illocutionary acts are acts performed by the speakers through utterances. Illocutionary acts became the focus of speech acts because illocutionary acts attempt

to perform the intended action of the speaker to make the interlocutor understand it. It refers to the utterances which have the power to influence the behavior of others. It also describes what speakers want to obtain in saying something such as to get hearers to know, to do something, to expect something, to express the speaker's feeling, and to praise (Austin 1962). Illocutionary acts can be understood if the context or the situation happened is clear. The type of speech act is related to its component. Moreover the components of the speech act can be determined by the background knowledge of the people who communicate, the status or position between speaker and interlocutor, and the way of how the speakers utter their utterances. To make it clearer, Searle (1976) classified illocutionary act into five classifications regarding to the component:

Agoraphobia is the human condition that causes the feeling of scared to go outside. It is an anxiety disorder in which a person is afraid of and avoids locations or situations that cause them to feel imprisoned, helpless, or embarrassed. According to Asmundson, Taylor, & Smits (2014), anxiety in response to being away from a 'safe' area, panic attacks with symptoms such as shortness, perspiration, dizziness, high heart rate, and choking feelings are all indicators of agoraphobia. Agoraphobia frequently develops after a stressful incident of the people, such as losing a job or ending a relationship. They are upset and limit their interaction with the outer world, this is referred to as 'avoidance behavior.' As time passes, they may consider more and more public places as 'out of bounds' until they are eventually confined to their home (Pollard & Zeurcher-White, 2003). To analyze the types of illocutionary acts in this study, the writer chooses and uses a theory from Searle (1976). Searle defined, explained, and developed speech acts in his essay "A Classification of Illocutionary Acts" in a journal titled *Language and Society*. The method used in this study is the descriptive qualitative method to get the result from the data collected before.

B. Method

Because the data were taken from the form of utterances, the writer used a qualitative method to analyze the data collected from Anna Fox's utterances in the movie "The Woman in The Window". According to Creswell (2003). This study used *The Woman in The Window* movie directed by Joe Wright and published in May 2021 and its script from Netflix as the source of data. Moreover, the data of this study was taken from the specific utterances of Anna Fox who is the main character in the movie "The Woman in The Window". To analyze the illocutionary acts of Anna Fox's utterances, the writer used purposive sampling method which is the method of collecting data by critiquing some specific data conditions that are the best fit to the study that wanted to be analyzed. Sugiyono (2016) stated that purposive sampling is a technique to determine samples with certain considerations. Based on the method of data collecting used in this study, the writer did some steps. First, the writer watched the movie *The Woman in The Window* and focus on Anna Fox's utterances which the intentions of her utterances are not believed by other characters and when she attempted to solve the incident by her own. Second, the writer read the dialogues of Anna Fox on the movie script to make sure what the writer hears from the movie. Then, the writer identified the illocutionary acts uttered by the main character which

are not believed by other characters and her utterances when she attempted to reveal the case. Moreover, the writer classified them into five classifications based on Searle's theory. Next, the writer determined a dominant type of illocutionary acts found from the data collected. The last, the writer identified the purpose of illocutionary acts from the data that found before. The data collected from Anna Fox's utterances were classified into five illocutionary acts classifications such as assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. To know the classification of the data, the writer identified and explained the intention of the utterance based on the explanation of classification of illocutionary acts from Searle (1976). The writer also identified and explained the context of each utterance like when and how the situation in the movie when the utterance is being uttered. For example, when Anna Fox says, "No! I know what I saw," the context in the movie when this utterance is being uttered is when the detective checks around Anna's house then says that there is nothing happen. Then, based on the context found and using Searle's theory (1976), the writer analyzed the intention of the main character as the speaker in her selected utterances. Lastly, the writer determined which classification of illocutionary acts of those utterances based on the context and the intentions found before.

C. Findings and Discussion

1.1 Data Finding

This is the data of the classifications of illocutionary acts that the writer found in the main character's utterances in the movie. The writer uses a table to show the data finding of the classifications of illocutionary acts.

The data above are the utterances of the main character that have classified according to Searle's illocutionary acts classification. The result that the writer found is there are four out of five classifications of illocutionary acts from the main character utterances, they are 18 utterances of assertives, 16 utterances of directives, an utterance of commissives, and 5 utterances of expressives. Moreover, the purposes of the utterances of the main character are including concluding, stating, complaining, asking, requesting, ordering, commanding, begging, creating a duty, apologizing, disliking, and thanking. The dominant purpose is concluding, this is because the main character often explains something that refers to her condition. The main character did that because other characters in the movie were doubted to her.

1.2 Discussion

In this point, the writer shows the explanation of each data that were found from the table above. This explains the contexts and situations that happen in the movie when the utterances being uttered. This also describes the interpretations of the writer in each utterance.

Dispatcher : 911 operator, what's your emergency?

Anna : **My neighbor, Jane, she's been stabbed.**

Dispatcher : Slow down, ma'am. What's your name and where are you?

The classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance "My neighbor, Jane, she's been stabbed," is directives. The thing that indicates that the utterance is directives is because after the main character saw the murder incident through her window, she immediately ran to her telephone and called the police in order to get

some help. Then, when the dispatcher answered her call and asked her about her emergency, the main character explained what happened to her neighbor to the police through the phone. The act or intention of the main character is a request to the police because she told something emergency that need them to come and bring some help. Though the form of this utterance is declarative and not imperative, the function of this utterance explains the emergency that the dispatcher wanted to know and asked about it to her when the dispatcher said “What is your emergency?”. Because of that, the intended meaning in this utterance is to make the police to do something by explaining the situation that she witnessed. This intention also strengthens when the police asked her address after they know the situation. She was also panic and her breath was heavy when talked to the police through the phone.

Mr. Russell: You have never met my wife.

Anna : **She helped one night. We spent the evening together.**

Mr. Russell: No, no. No, I don't think so.

The utterance “She helped one night. We spent the evening together,” is classified as assertives. The factor that can make this utterance is counted as assertives is because the detectives and Mr. Russell, Jane's husband, said that she never met her and the main character then said that Jane helped her and talked with her to conclude that she has met her. The main character was strongly sure about what she said because she remembered that she spent the night together with Jane and talked about many things at that night together. The main character said about her belief that she met and talked to her neighbor who was killed. She also talked in a very convincing tone. This is because Mr. Russell said that she never met her wife; then, the main character responded it by saying that she ever met with Mr. Russell's wife “She helped me one night.” She also explained about how long that she met with her “We spent the evening together” in order to convince him. However, Mr. Russell still did not think that the main character has ever met his wife.

Mr. Russell : I was looking for my son, not my wife. You told
me no one had been here

Anna : I lied. **We played gin.**

Mr. Russell : Why would you lied about that?

The classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “We played gin,” is assertives. The context is the main character told that Mr. Russell ever came to her house and was looking for his wife. However, Mr. Russell disproved it and said that someone who his was looking for is his son, not his wife. The main character said that she lied about his wife who came to her house because she was afraid that he would punish his wife if he knew that. Again, the main character explained what she did with her neighbor, Jane. The main character made a statement that Jane was in her house by saying “We played gin” which means that they have played something together and she concluded that she and Jane have ever met before. However, the detectives were still unsure because the alibi of Mr. Russell was also trustworthy. At this moment, the detectives were more in favor of Mr. Russell than the main character.

Detective Little : The point is, Dr. Fox, that's nothing

happened
Anna : No.
Detective Little : Hmm?
Anna : **No! I know what I saw!**

This utterance of the main character “No! I know what I saw!” is classified as assertives. The thing that makes this main character’s utterance counts as assertives is because Detective Little said that there was nothing happened around the main character’s house but the main character was very sure about what she saw. She tried to convince everyone in there that she saw the murder incident. The main character got up from the sofa as she said this line. This shows how sure she was about what she saw earlier because the reaction of Detective Little, “Hmm?” mean that he did not sure about what the main character said, “No.” Then, the main character repeated again and said “I know what I saw!” as an additional to show that she really knew about what have happened to Jane.

Detective Little : Nothing’s happened to anyone.
Anna : **No, I was zoomed in with camera.**
Detective Norelli : Did you take the picture?

The detective once again said that there was nothing happen that night but the main character explained how she was very sure about the murder incident that she saw because she looked at that incident through her camera (viewfinder) and zoomed it in. The main character wanted to show to everyone, especially the detectives that she was not just boasting. She knew that incident was really happened and remembered every detail of it. Unfortunately, she did not record or take a picture of it with her camera. Thus, the classification of the illocutionary act of the utterance “No, I was zoomed in with camera,” is assertives. By saying that, the main character tried to convince the detectives that she saw the incident clearly and “I was zoomed in with the camera” was her intended that she was not hallucinated because she saw it not just with her eyes but with the help of camera lens which zoomed that made the incident as if happened in front of her eyes.

Detective Little : The important thing is, is that everybody’s
okay, yeah?
Anna : **Then where is she? Where’s Jane?**

Jane is a name that the main character knew, she is the victim of the murder incident the main character witnessed. The detective said that everybody’s okay, no one hurt and there was nobody who found hurt. The main character then wanted to make sure about what the detectives and Mr. Russell said. She asked them where Jane was “Then where is she? Where’s Jane?”, the main character wanted everyone in there to prove that nothing happened to Jane by asking where is Jane. By asking “Where’s Jane?” the main character wanted someone to bring Jane to her. Detective Little said that everybody was okay which means that he knew exactly the condition of Jane and where she was. The main character who thought that the one who should not to be okay was Jane, wanted to see if Jane was really okay and still alive like Detective

Little said. Therefore, the utterance of the main character “Then where is she? Where’s Jane” is classified as directives because the main character directly wanted the interlocutor to proof something after what the interlocutor said.

Jane Russell : I’m sorry we haven’t met. I’m Jane Russell.

Anna : **She’s not Jane.**

Jane Russell, the wife of Mr. Russell whom the main character saw stabbed by a knife really came. However, Jane who appeared in front of the main character was not Jane that she knew. Jane that the main character knew was the woman who helped her when she fainted, then when she asked her “You’re Jane Russell?” the woman did not deny or confirm it clearly to her. It made the image of Jane in the main character about Jane Russell was different. Because of that, the main character then said that Jane Russell who appeared in front of her this time was not really Jane Russell. She was totally different from Jane Russell that she met. As the result the classification of the illocutionary act in “She’s not Jane” is assertives because the main character stated what she believed or knew about Jane who was different from another Jane who came; from now, the Jane that the main character met before is called as Jane (False). When Jane Russell greeted the main character, the main character then said “She’s not Jane” to everyone. The main character’s intention was to say to everyone that Jane Russell in front of her was the wrong person.

Jane Russell: I promise I am.

Anna : No, you’re not Jane. She’s not Jane. **I know Jane. Jane’s been in my house.**

Mr. Russell : This is absurd.

The classification of the illocutionary act in “I know Jane. Jane’s been in my house,” is assertives. This utterance counts as assertives because when Jane Russell vowed to the main character if she was the real Jane, the main character once again said that she was not Jane because Jane (False) was ever in her house “Jane’s been in my house.” She remembered that Jane (False) helped her when she fainted. She also said that she knew Jane (False) “I know Jane” because she did many things with Jane (False); so, she still stood in her opinion that the woman who was standing in front of her was not Jane that she knew. She said this line while looking into everyone’s eyes to show that she has a strong argument.

Anna : **Get Ethan.**

After Jane Russell appeared, the main character was not satisfied because she still did not know about Jane (False) who she saw stabbed. The situation became absurd like what Mr. Russell said because everyone did not know that the understanding about Jane between them and the main character was different. Then, the main character wanted to meet Ethan, the son of Mr. Russell and Jane Russell who also ever come to her house before. By saying “Get Ethan,” to Ethan’s parents, she wanted them to bring Ethan to her. After that, Ethan came by himself but just stood in front of the door. Everyone looked at him and waited for him to clarify the absurdity of the situation. Therefore, this utterance is classified into directives because the main character as the speaker directly ordered the interlocutors to bring their child to her.

Ethan : Are you okay, Dr. Fox?

Anna : **Tell them.**

Ethan : You've never met my mother.

Ethan came and asked about how was her "Are you okay, Dr. Fox" because Ethan saw the detectives and his parents are in the same place. The main character did not answer Ethan's question properly and directly ordered him to explain the situation till all things about the absurdity are clear. The main character expected that Ethan could help her to convince the detectives. When the main character said "Tell them" to Ethan, she wanted Ethan to tell everything that he knew about the main character, him, and Jane. Ethan was the only person that the main character could rely on because she did not meet many people due to her agoraphobia. Therefore, as the result, the classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance "Tell them" is directives. However, Ethan said that she has never met Jane, his mother. That was made her shocked, she thought that Ethan lied to her.

Man : Why didn't you take a picture?

Anna : **I was trying to help her. Not record it for prosperity.
Are you doubting me too?**

Man : I'm on your side.

Anna : You don't sound like it.

The classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance "I was trying to help her. Not record it for prosperity. Are you doubting me too?" is expressives. After everything seemed to be clear that everyone is okay, the discussion is finished and everyone went back to their home. The main character then called a man and told him about everything that happened before. She thought that man would be in her side and trust her. However, in this case, the man on the phone also doubted and blamed her because she did not take the picture and just looked at the incident with her camera "Why didn't you take a picture?" The main character seemed dislike to what the man that she called said. The man on the phone usually supported her when she was in a problem or something that she could not handle. The main character was very disappointed because her tone was rising. "I was trying to help her. Not record it for prosperity" is the thing that the main character wanted the man to believe. However, because the man blamed her, she felt disappointed because the man also doubted her "Are you doubting me too?" because the respond of the man was not like what she expected.

David : Ask me what? Huh? Here I am, what's your question?

Anna : **Jane. Have you met her? Have you met the woman
across the street?**

David : Jane?

Anna : Jane Russell.

The main character decided to investigate the case by herself. She looked for the background of the Russells, Mr. Russell and Jane Russell, on the internet. She also wanted to know the information of the Russells by asking David, her tenant who lived in her basement. She thought that David probably knew about the Russells, especially Jane Russell. David asked "Ask me what?" and "What's your question" to the main character. After that, by asking David about Jane, "Jane. Have you met her? Have you met the woman across the street?" she wanted David to give the information to her.

She asked David “Jane. Have you met her?” to find out if David has met Jane or not. Then, the main character clarified it by explaining that Jane was the woman who lived across her house “Have you met the woman across the street.” As the result, it can be concluded that the utterance of the main character “Jane. Have you met her? Have you met the woman across the street?” is classified into directives because the main character as the speaker wanted David as the interlocutor to do something which is give or share the information about Jane.

David : No.

Anna : **You worked with them.**

David : I worked for him. For Mr. Russell. I never met his wife. What am I, your messenger now?

David answered that he never met Jane Russell. The main character seemed doubt his answer. David is a craftsman and she knew that David helped them when they moved to their new house which is across the street. She felt weird because how could not David meet Jane Russell after working with them for a few days. “You worked with them” shows that she repeated her question “Have you met the woman across the street?” but in a different form with a little force and sarcasm. It is also be strengthened by David who answered more clearly that he worked for Mr. Russell, not his wife “I worked for him. For Mr. Russell” and never met Mr. Russell’s wife “I never met his wife.” Therefore, the classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “You worked with them” is directives.

Man : If I can’t say what I think...

Anna : **I’m not delusional.**

Man : Break it down. First it’s the boy, then that murder across the street. Now there’s another woman in Boston... An earring, and fucking David, who you always liked.

The main character found Jane’s earring in David’s room. She then called a man and told him what she just found. The man on the phone thought that the situation became illogical because it was getting wilder, from Ethan, Mr. Russell, and now David. The main character said that she was not delusional because she remembered the shape of Jane’s earring that Jane showed when they had a talk. When the man said “If I can’t say what I think,” the main character thought that the man wanted to say that she was delusional. She then immediately responded it by saying her believe that she was not delusional “I’m not delusional.” Moreover, the man on the phone then mentioned everything that he thought was weird and made the incident that the main character has seen became wider.

Anna : **Where’s your mother?**

The main character saw Ethan goes out of his house. She then opened the window and shouted to him. She asked Ethan about his mother because Ethan said she never met his mother and the detectives said that everyone was okay “Where’s your mother?” The classification of the illocutionary act in this utterance is directives because when the main character saw Ethan went out from his house, she then immediately wanted Ethan to clarify the situation. When the main character asked “Where,” it means that the main character wanted Ethan to bring his mother or do

something to prove that his mother was really okay so the main character can confirm that.

Ethan : Stop it

Anna : **Ethan? Why are you lying to me?**

Ethan wanted the main character to stop shouting because everyone nearby could hear that. However, the main character did not care about it and once again shouted to Ethan and asked him the reason why he lied when he said “You’ve never met my mother.” She was very sure that he knew the truth but did not tell to the detectives. She wanted to know the reason that made him lie. Then, Ethan went to her because she would always shout and everyone could hear that. The utterance “Ethan? Why are you lying to me?” is classified into directives. The main character asked “Why” which means that she wanted Ethan to explain to explain the reason why he was lying to her.

Ethan : You never met my mother

Anna : **You were lying and you know it.**

Ethan : You’re just confused,

Ethan did not want to tell the reason why he lied and said that she never met his mother because in reality the main character really never met his mother and the woman who she thought was Jane was a mistake. However, the main character thought that Ethan clearly played around with her “You were lying.” She also concluded that Ethan intentionally lied which made her witnesses was distrusted by everyone “... And you know it.” Ethan then responded it and said that she just confused because she still did not know truth about his mother and the person who she thought was Jane. As the result, the classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “You were lying and you know it” is assertives.

Ethan : You don’t. You’re just wrong.

Anna : **We talked about you. She told me about you!**

Ethan : Please don’t do this to me.

Ethan said that the main character was make a mistake about his mother. Then the main character explained to Ethan that she had a lot of talk with Jane about him “We talked about you.” She even said it again in a different way by changing the pronoun “We” to “She” to emphasize that the person who talked with her was Jane “She told me about you!” She tried to make Ethan change his mind because she and Jane have met before. On the other hand. Ethan felt under pressure and not comfortable because the main character kept pushing him. The utterance “We talked about you. She told me about you!” is classified as assertives because the main character said the fact that she believed to be true.

Detective Norelli : Nothing up here.

Detective Little : You see, coast is clear.

Anna : **Can you track the email?**

The main character was sent an email with a photo of her while sleeping. She then called the detectives because he felt insecure. Then, the detectives came and checked that email. They also checked if there was someone broken the house but everything was clear “Nothing up here,” “You see, coast is clear.” The main character

still did not satisfy because expected that the detectives could find the suspect, she then asked detective Little that could he track it “Can you track the email?” because she thought that the detectives could do something like track the email in order to find out who was the sender or who was the email address belong to. Therefore, the classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “Can you track the email?” is directives because the main character requested someone to do something.

Detective Little ; Track it?

Anna : **Or trace it? Whatever.**

Detective Little : No, you can’t track a Gmail account right.

Detective Little asked the main character to make sure about what she said “Track it?” The main character then said something that similar to what she said before “Or trace it?” As an addition, she really wanted him to do something that attempts to find out people from their email address no matter what that terms called “Whatever” because that could threaten her. She wanted him to find who was the sender of the email was no matter how because the sender could do another thing that may be worse than it. However, the detective said that they cannot track a Gmail account. The classification of the illocutionary act in the main character’s utterance, “Or trace it? Whatever” is directives because she wanted the detectives to do another thing that they can do.

Detective Norelli : You could’ve sent this to yourself.

Anna : **I’m sleeping.**

Detective Norelli : Or you wanted to look asleep.

Anna : I’m asleep. What the hell?

Detective Norelli thought that the main character took a photo of herself and then sent the photo with a different email address to her own email. She did not believe about what detective Norelli think, she then said that she was really sleeping and the accusation of the detectives was not true “I’m sleeping.” She was even shocked when the first time she saw that email. The main character’s utterance. She said that she was sleeping in order to make Detective Norelli changes her thought about the main character. However, Detective Norelli did not believe that and even said that the main character pretended to sleep “Or wanted to look asleep.” “I’m sleeping” is classified into assertives because she said a fact that she did something that was true.

Detective Little : Dr. Fox, there is no sign that anyone has been here, okay? Nothing is missing.

Detective Norelli : Doors and windows look okay.

Anna : **Someone has been in my house, I have given you proof.**

The main character concluded the situation to the detectives that she did not make up that email incident “Someone has been in my house.” On the contrary, she was accused by them, and they thought she played around them “Dr. Fox, there is no sign that anyone has been here, okay?” They also could not find any suspicious thing in her house “Doors and windows look okay.” They also still did not believe her until this time. She expected that the detectives could save her or catch the sender of that

email “I have given you proof.” Therefore, the classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “Someone has been in my house. I have given you proof” is assertive because the main character who was the speaker stated something that she believed to be true to the interlocutor.

Mr. Russell : What’s this?
Anna : **This is a picture that your wife drew and signed.** And you call me delusional, you motherfucker.

Detective Norelli : Hey, hey!

The classification of the illocutionary act of the utterance “This is a picture that your wife drew and signed” is assertives. Again, the main character explained that she has met Jane to the detectives and Mr. Russell. She now even showed them a picture that Jane drew when they met in her house. When Mr. Russell asked what was the thing that the main character showed “What’s this?”, the main character then explained it and tried to make everyone consider her witnesses by showing proof which was the picture “This is a picture.” Moreover, the main character once again emphasized that she was not lie by saying “...That your wife drew and signed,” it means that the main character wanted to make everyone believe that Jane (false) was in her house and they have met each other.

Detective Little : It’s you.
Anna : **She was here, that proves it.**
Mr. Russell : That doesn’t prove anything. That proves you’re out of your mind.

Detective Little took the picture that the main character shown. He then accused and thought that picture was drawn by her, not Jane “It’s you.” She told the detectives again and again that Jane (false) was really been in her house “She was here.” She had a strong argument with that picture which was drawn and signed by Jane. With that picture, she concluded that what she said all the time about her meeting with Jane (false) was true because there was Jane's sign on that picture “...That proves it.” Thus, because her intention in her utterance “She was here, that proves it” was to conclude something, the classification of illocutionary acts in this utterance is assertives.

Anna : I see the way that you’re all looking at me.
I’m not crazy.

The utterance “I’m not crazy” is classified into assertives. It can be indicated when everybody was at the same room, the main characters tried to convince them with a serious face and heavy tone. She wanted to make them think that she also deserved to be trusted. Everyone just stood in silent while listened to her. The main character thought that everyone doubted her by looking the way they were looking to her “I see the way that you’re all looking at me.” At that time, she once again said that she was not crazy to convince everyone who was focus to her “I’m not crazy.”

Anna : **I’m not hallucinating. Do I seem unreasonable?**

The way they looked at her was made her feel under pressure. She raised her intonation that showed if she was very serious about what she saw “I’m not hallucinating.” She also said that she did not make up the facts and proofs that she found and her witnesses could be trustworthy to be consider “...Do I seem unreasonable?”. This time, everyone just listened to what she said. The classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “I’m not hallucinating. Do I seem unreasonable?” is assertives because the main character said something that she believes and thinks that it is true.

Anna : **I have evidence. There was that picture that Jane drew and she signed, and there’s a photograph that somebody took of me while I was sleeping.**

The main character mentioned all things that can be the evidences that she was not hallucinated “I have evidence.” All of those things were strong evidences and she could proof it. The first thing is the picture that drawn by Jane “There was that picture that Jane drew and she signed,” and the photo of her which taken by someone while she was sleeping “... There’s a photograph that somebody took of me while I was sleeping,” and everyone could see those things because she showed it to them. She thought that it was weird when everyone said she hallucinated because she remembered every detail and had something to proof it. This utterance is classified into assertives because the main character concluded about her condition with things as the proof.

Anna : Of course... You are. **I’m really sorry that I involved you in... All of this.**

Still in the same feeling, the main character looked to Jane Russell and apologized to her. She apologized to her because she doubted her when they met for the first time “I’m really sorry.” She felt guilty to Jane Russell because she made her to be in the complicated situation by saying “I involved you in... All of this” as an additional. The classification of the illocutionary act of the utterance “I’m really sorry that I involved you in... All of this” is expressives. The main character once again apologized to someone.

Anna : **I’m so sorry that I mixed Ethan up in this.** I don’t... I don’t know... What you must think. All of you.

The main character really expressed her guilty “I’m so sorry.” She apologized to Mr. Russell because she brought Ethan along with her problem “... I mixed Ethan up in this.” She knew that she was a child psychologist. So, she was not supposed to bring children into a problem that they could not handle. The main character’s utterance, “I’m so sorry that I mixed Ethan up in this” is classified as expressives, the main character showed her guilt to someone and regret it.

Anna : I want to go back. I want to do it over. **I want to do it different.** And I can’t.

The main character made a video of her and it could be her testament video. In that video, she told everything that happened to her, about her family, and also about her condition that she cannot stand to it anymore. She always ran from

something that could make her in a trouble before. Because of that, she did not run at that time and wanted to do something that usually people do when they saw an accident “I want to do it over. I want to do it different,” but in the end, she cannot do that “And I can’t.” The classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “I want to do it different is commissives because the main character created a duty that she made to herself.

Anna : Hello?

David : Sorry. Tried to call. I just need to get my umbrella and my gloves.

Anna : **Can you come up? Uh, just for a moment.**

The main character found something that can be proof that she was not hallucinating about Jane. David came from the outside. After the main character could confirm that it was David, the main character went out from her room and called David. She wanted David to come to her room “Can you come up?” because she wanted to show him something important. Moreover, she also said that it did not took a long time in order to make David wanted to come “Uh, just for a moment.” The classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance “Can you come up? Uh, just for a moment” is directives because the main character invited someone to come to her room.

David : Uh, just for a moment. I’m soaking wet. I had a long day and it’s not about to end soon.

Anna : **Please. It’ll just take a minute.**

David said that he wanted to change his clothes first because his clothes were wet “Uh, just for a moment. I’m soaking wet.” The main character then begged David to come to her room just for a while “Please. It’ll just take a minute” because she has something important to show to him. The main character's utterance, “Please. It’ll just take a minute” is classified into directives because the main character begged someone to do something that she wanted immediately.

Anna : **Thank you.**

David : For what?

The classification of the illocutionary act of the utterance “Thank you” is expressive. It clearly can be seen when expressed her feeling of thanking when David did what she wanted and walked to her room with his wet clothes. Then, the main character thanked David because this time he listened to her and was not neglected her wish for him to come to her room “Thank you.”

Anna : **I wanna show you... A picture.**

When David arrived in front of her room, the main character then guided David to something that she wanted to show to him. She wanted David to identify the reflection of someone’s face in the picture that the main character showed to him to make sure that she was not the only one who saw that face. This utterance is classified into directives because the main character’s intention was to order someone to identify

something. The intention of the main character is ordering because the interval in her utterances showed the highlighted thing "... A picture" and also stressed this part. It made the interlocutor, David, would immediately focus to the picture.

- Anna : The face in the wine glass.
David : Yeah, I see it.
Anna : **That is the woman that I saw murdered. She said that her name was Jane Russell.**
David : Her name is Katie.
Anna : What?

With the reflection shown in the picture, the main character concluded that what she said about a woman who came to her house was true "That is the woman that I saw murdered." David also confirmed it. She then told to David that woman on the glass's reflection was Jane Russell "She said that her name was Jane Russell." However, David said that her name is Katie and that made her shocked. Then David told to the main character what he knew about Katie. The main character's utterance, "That is the woman that I saw murdered. She said that her name was Jane Russell" is classified into assertives because the main character concluded something based on what she found.

- Anna : **I showed you... the picture.**
David : Yeah, looking very much alive.

The main character told David that the woman whom she saw stabbed was really exist. She wanted to convince David who was still looking at the picture and tried to analyze the person's reflection but David doubted that Katie was killed "Yeah, looking very much alive." The classification of the illocutionary act in the main character's utterance, "I showed you... the picture" is assertives. The main character concluded something that she believed by showing something. The highlighted thing in the main character's utterance is "... The picture." She stressed this part to make the interlocutor, David, trust her because she already showed it to him "I showed you ..."

- Anna : She's real. **And I need you to go to the police with me.**
David : No. No, no.

The main character's utterance, "And I need you to go to the police with me" is classified into directives. After David confirmed the reflection of the woman in the picture, the main character wanted David to become her witness to prove that she was not hallucinated and the accident that she saw really happened. She wanted David to accompany her to meet the police to strengthen her witnesses. However, David did not want to help her because he still thought that she was hallucinated. He also has his own reason that he did want to have a business with police officer. Anna : **David! You can't just run away from this!**

- David : Watch me.

David did not want to accompany her because it would make him get in a serious situation. He then walked out of the main character's room. The main character who only has a chance from David as her witness said that David could not get away from this situation and leave her. She thought that after she showed the picture to David, he should help her because he knew something important "David! You can't just run away from this!" She wanted David to think again about what he was going to do but he did not and still go out from her room "Watch me." The utterance "David! You can't just run away from this!" is classified into directives because the main character wanted someone to do something with a little force.

Anna : Oh, shit! **Please, David!**

The classification of the illocutionary act in the utterance "Please, David!" is directives. The indication that can make this utterance counted as directives is the response of the main character. David still in his decision that he did not want to accompany the main character and was getting further. The main character realized that she could not convince David "Oh, shit!" She then chased David who was not in her sight anymore and beg to him because he was the only one who knew about the person in the picture shown by her "Please, David!".

D. Conclusion

In conclusion, the study reveals that speakers, in their communication, enact various illocutionary acts, reflecting their intentions and purposes. Within the context of "The Woman in the Window" movie, the main character's utterances encompass four out of the five classifications of illocutionary acts outlined by Searle (1976). Despite encountering disbelief from other characters due to her agoraphobic background, the main character predominantly employs assertives, expressing her beliefs to convince others. Through intonation and earnestness, she emphasizes her sincerity in her statements and observations. Moreover, the analysis identifies distinct purposes embedded within each illocutionary act performed by the main character. These purposes range from asserting conclusions to issuing requests and expressing emotions. Importantly, the success of these illocutionary acts hinges not on the speaker but on the hearer's interpretation and response. For future researchers interested in analyzing speech acts, particularly illocutionary acts, it is recommended to select fresh and compelling cases, with a clear understanding of the significance behind the chosen utterances. Understanding the underlying motives and contexts enriches the analysis and ensures its relevance. Ultimately, this study offers new insights into communication dynamics and underscores the nuanced value of utterances, contingent upon the recipient's reception. It advocates for a more empathetic consideration of individuals' testimonies, even when influenced by medical conditions or hallucinations. By recognizing the complexity of communication and the subjective nature of interpretation, individuals can foster greater understanding and empathy in their interactions.

E. References

- Asmundson, G. J., Taylor, S., & Smits, J. A. (2014). Panic Disorder and Agoraphobia: An Overview and Commentary on DSM-5 Changes. *Depress Anxiety*, 480-486.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundation in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Massachuset, United States of America: Blackwell.
- Nadeak, M. F., Sunggingwati, D., Valiantien, N. M. (2017). An Analysis of Illocutionary Act and Perlocutionary Act of Judy Hoops' Utterances in Zootopia Movie (2016). *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 305-316.
- Nartey, M. (2013). A Speech Act Analysis of Status Updates on Facebook: The Case Of Ghanaian University Students. *Language in India*, 114-141.
- Pollard, C. A., & Zeurcher-White, E. (2003). *The Agoraphobia Workbook: A Comprehensive Program to End Your Fear of Symptom Attacks*. Oakland: New Harbringer.
- Rahayu, F. N., Arifin, M. B., Ariani, S. (2018). Illocutionary Act in The Main Characters' Utterances in Mirror Mirror Movie. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 175-187.
- Richard, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language* (3rd ed.). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classifications of Illocutionary Acts. *Language and Society*, 1-23.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wright, J. (Director). (2021). *The Woman in The Window* [Motion Picture].
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.