

An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Gordon Ramsay Commentary on Hell's Kitchen Season 21 Episodes 1-2

Hanifah Yuliani¹

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung
e-mail: hanifahyuliani3@gmail.com¹

Andang Saehu²

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung
e-mail: andangsaeu@uinsgd.ac.id²

Dian Budiarti³

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung
e-mail: dianbudiarti@uinsgd.ac.id³

Submitted: May 4, 2024

Accepted: July 15, 2024

ABSTRACT

Communicating is a way for humans to convey information or messages that they want to share with others. Illocutionary acts often occur in everyday life related to speech acts between people. This research analyzes the illocutionary acts and how illocutionary acts are conveyed in the comments of Gordon Ramsay, who is a judge and head chef in the reality show Hell's Kitchen Season 21 Episodes 1-2. The qualitative method with content analysis is used in this research. Data is taken from the available subtitle transcripts on each episode of this reality show. Searle's theory is used to classify the types of illocutionary acts and then to identify the way of conveying illocutionary acts. This study found 94 data on the type of illocutionary act by direct and indirect speech acts. The findings showed the types of illocutionary acts were representative (36 data), expressive (29 data), directive (20 data), declarative (5 data), and commissive (4 data). Representative became the type of illocutionary act most used in this research. In addition, this illocutionary act is most often conveyed by direct speech acts, as much 73 data while indirect speech acts are 21 data. This type and method of conveying were most dominant because Gordon Ramsay's comments contained statements and judgments about the participant's dished and cooking skills based on his beliefs. Therefore, his comments directly state the meaning he wants to convey without hidden meanings.

Keywords: *Speech act, Illocutionary act, direct speech act, indirect speech act, comment*

INTRODUCTION

In everyday life, communication is an important part of humans because through communication, humans can exchange information or messages with each other. The delivery of information or messages is the purpose of communication. Communication will run smoothly when speakers and listeners understand the message being conveyed. Therefore, successful communication between the speaker and the listener. When communication occurs, the utterance by the speaker is expected to be interpreted well by the listeners so the listener must understand the speaker's intention and communication goes well. For example, when the speaker says that she/he is happy, the listener must be able to understand that it means happy. Communication requires a certain context, so that

the listener understands what the speaker means (Heriyanto & Garnida, 2022). However, in reality, failed communications still occur a lot, and cause misunderstandings because the listener cannot interpret the speaker's meaning.

In addition, communication can be created because of language as a medium of communication. According to Siahaan (2008), language is a uniquely human way that holds an important role in human life, including how to think about things, communicate, and interact with others. This language can be used by people with different cultures. In addition, the conveyance of language or utterances is divided into two types, namely direct speech act and indirect speech act. It is used to convey meaning both directly and indirectly.

In language analysis, people's actions in uttering words are known as speech acts. This speech act theory is part of the study of pragmatics. According to Grundy (2019), pragmatics is the study of the speaker's meaning, which appears from the use of language. A speech act is the utterance of a sentence to state something so the listener knows the speaker's intention. As Yule (1996) said, speech act is a theory that analyses an action performed through utterance. This statement aligns with Huang's (2014) statement that speech acts are the pronunciation of linguistic expressions that function not only to say but also to do something or actively perform an action. In addition, the function of this speech act is to show the action when we apologize, congratulate, order, ask for advice, warn, complain, or express the speaker's purpose. This speech act cannot be avoided in everyday life, but sometimes the meaning of the speech act itself needs to be more understood. For this reason, it is necessary to understand the interpretation of speech acts.

According to Austin (1962) (in Levinson, 1983: 236), speech acts are divided into three types, namely locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. According to Austin (1962), locutionary act is the word that are actually spoken by the speaker. In other words, the speaker's act of saying something follows the meaning conveyed or by the grammatical structure. Perlocutionary is the effect of the speech uttered by the speaker to the listener. Meanwhile, an illocutionary act is an action shown by the speaker's speech, and usually this illocutionary utterance wants action from the listener. Therefore, illocutionary acts can be divided into several types based on Searle's theory. According to Searle (1979), illocutionary acts are divided into five types: assertive (also known as representative), declarative, commissive, directive, and expressive.

Illocutionary acts can be found in daily conversations to convey someone's intention or desire. Furthermore, illocutionary acts can appear on several mediums of communication. One of them is online media, such as streaming services that offer television shows, such as reality shows and more. One of the famous streaming platforms today is Netflix. Netflix has many series that many people favour, such as Hell's Kitchen reality show. Hell's Kitchen is an American cooking competition reality show airing on Netflix and hosted by celebrity chef Gordon Ramsay. Moreover, Ramsay is the head chef and judge of this show. In Hell's Kitchen, Gordon Ramsay uses illocutionary acts to convey something from his comments, and he also expects his utterance to produce

actions from his listeners. He was tasked with commenting on the participants' cooking results before being served to customers. His comment is famous for his emotional, rude, and sarcastic that makes participants depressed. As the Diamondback News reports, never question the wisdom of esteemed head chef Gordon Ramsay, lest you want to be immediately kicked out of the kitchen by the grumpiest Brit on TV (DBK Admin, 2016). Based on this phenomenon, researchers are interested in examining Gordon Ramsay's commentary on Hell's Kitchen 21 to see the types of illocutionary acts in Ramsay's comments. Besides that, the researcher also wants to analyze how the illocutionary acts conveyed by Gordon Ramsay.

Relevant research related to illocutionary acts has been studied by Putri et al. (2020). This research investigates illocutionary acts in the judges' comments at the America Next Top Model and Asia's Next Top Model competitions. This research produces utterances included in illocutionary acts at the America Next Top Model (74 data) and Asia Next Top Model (74 data) events. Siregar and Salsabila (2021) examined the use of illocutionary acts in Ganjar Pranomo's speech in One Hour Closer talk show; this research found five types of illocutionary acts and 11 functions of illocutionary acts, including stating, complaining, advising, offering, praising, and firing. Rahmi et al. (2023) analyzed illocutionary acts in Prince Harry's interview. The result of their research is that they found 64 utterances that belong to the five types of illocutionary acts, and the most frequently used by Prince Harry is the assertive act.

LITERATURE

REVIEW Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that discusses the meaning of speech. Besides that, pragmatics also studies language associated with the context of uses. In pragmatics, context and meaning are closely related because the meaning of language can be understood if the context is known. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is a study of contextual meaning. Meanwhile, according to Bublitz and Norrick (2011, p. 4), pragmatics deals with meaning in context. This means, for analysis it can be seen from different perspectives, namely speaker, receiver, analysis, etc. On the other hand, Thomas (1995) argues that pragmatics is concerned with understanding the speaker's meaning. This is because meaning in interaction is related to the context and potential meaning of utterances produced by the speaker or listener (Sidik et al., 2022).

This can be understood from the above definition that pragmatics is a study related to or studying the meaning of speech that is still associated with the context being discussed between the speaker and the listener. In this pragmatic, the meaning of a statement or utterance is closely related to the situation or context in which the statement or utterance is uttered. However, pragmatics allows us to understand how meanings beyond words can be researched without ambiguity.

Speech Acts

Speech acts are actions that produce grammatical utterances to the listener. In other words, this speech act is the action performed in saying something. As Austin (1962) states, speech acts are the actions performed in saying something. On the other hand, the purpose of this speech act concept is to provide an understanding of how the speaker uses language to complete and how the listener interprets the speaker's speech (Sidik et al., 2022). In English, they are labelled as invitations, apologies, promises, complaints, or requests. This is related to the effort to express themselves; people not only produce utterances that contain grammatical elements and words, but they also perform action through utterance. In addition, speech acts are individual symptoms that are psychological and continuous, which are determined by the speaker's language skills in dealing with specific situations (Nur & Simatupang, 2022). This speech act functions to inform or say something and also do something.

According to Levinson (in Mey, 2001), speech acts are not just words but must be considered in terms of communication. This means that when someone utters a speech act, it is not just words but causes an action from his speech, then performs an activity that brings about a change of situation. In this speech act, the principle of the speaker's ability to convey or express the meaning of his speech is contained in speech acts and also in phases. It refers to the method of making the listener do or not do what the speaker says. Furthermore, Austin provides a three-way contrast among the types of action performed when language is used, namely the distinction between act of locution, illocution, and perlocution (Ward & Horn, 2006, p. 54). Furthermore, Austin divides them into three types, namely:

a. Locutionary acts

According to Austin (in Ward & Horn, 2006), locutionary acts are acts of speaking, acts involved in the construction of speech, such as uttering certain sounds or making certain marks, using particular language and with certain sense and certain references as determined by the rules of the language from which they are drawn. Meanwhile, Rustono (in Herman, 2020) states that locutionary is a speech act that aims to communicate something, namely the action to state something with the words and the meaning of the sentence by the meaning of the word in the dictionary and the meaning following the rules of the structure. Thus, it can be concluded that locutionary acts are speech acts with the aim of communication, which is an action in stating something through utterances and has meaning by the literal and structure.

b. Illocutionary acts

Austin (1962) states that an illocutionary act is the act of doing something that contains the intention and function or power of the utterance. Therefore, illocutionary is an act that functions to inform or say something and is done to do

something.

c. Perlocutionary Acts

According to Austin (in Ward & Horn, 2006), perlocutionary acts consist of the production of effect on the thoughts, feelings, or actions of the recipient, speaker, or others. Thus, perlocutionary speech acts should be understood as a casual relationship between two events because utterances are the production of utterances by speakers. So, this perlocutionary act affects the listener or the listener's reaction to the speaker's speech.

Illocutionary Acts

As previously described, this section further discusses the illocutionary act. An illocutionary act is an utterance that has specific power in its utterance (Austin, 1962). This means that when saying something, the speaker does not do more than just say a useless utterance. Furthermore, Yule (1996:48) also argues that "illocutionary act is performed via the communicative force of an utterance." These two statements explain that illocutionary acts are a speaker's utterances with a specific purpose. For example, the utterance is intended to make an offer, a question, or an explanation. Thus, it can be concluded that an illocutionary act changes something through the utterance spoken by the speaker.

Type of Illocutionary Acts

According to Searle (1979), illocutionary acts are categorized into several types, such as representative, declarative, directive, commissive, and expressive. Here are the explanations about the types of illocutionary acts from some experts.

a. Representative

A representative illocutionary act is an act in which words express the state of affairs the speaker believes. In using this representative act, the speaker's words are in accordance with the world conditions (truth) (Yule, 1996). Furthermore, according to Huang (2014), the representative is a type of speech act that binds the speaker to the truth of the proposition expressed and thus carries the value of truth. Representative such as stating, claiming, describing, complaining, predicting, and reporting. For example:
"NCT is a South Korean boy band formed and managed by SM Entertainment."

b. Directive

Directive acts are speaker's attempts to persuade listeners to do something through language (Searle, 1969). Moreover, this directive speech act aims to influence the listener to do something according to the speaker's direction. According to Cutting and Fordyce (2021), some speech acts that belong to the directive are commanding, inviting, requesting, forbidding, suggesting, and

so on. For example:
“Sideways has great coffee.
“Go!”

c. Declarative

Declaration is an utterance that brings change in the world (Searle, 1997). This means speech acts that can change someone’s situation, such as appointing, resigning, announcing, candidates, and sentencing. In addition, a declarative is an action that causes an instantaneous change in the current state (Sidik et al., 2022, p. 66). In other words, the speaker creates a new status or situation for his speech partner through what he says. This statement is also supported by Seale’s statements (in Cutting, 2002) that these declarations are words and expressions that change the world through their speech, such as ‘I bet’, I resign’, and ‘I declare’. Example:
“I hereby pronounce you man and wife.”

d. Commissive

According to Searle (1979, p. 14), a commissive is an illocutionary act that aims to involve the listener in some future action. This commissive refers to speech acts where the speaker tries to convince the listener that the speaker will make a promise or offer. Kreidler (1998) says that commissive uses some verbs such as ask, swear, agree, offer, and refuse. However, Searle (1969, in Cutting and Fordyce, 2021) mentions utterances that show commissive illocutionary acts are promising, threatening, offering, refusing, and vowing. For example:
“We’ll be back”
“I’m going to love you for a long time without the thought of giving up.”

e. Expressive

An expressive illocutionary act is an utterance to express a psychological state specified in the condition of sincerity about a situation specified in the propositional content (Searle, 1997). This means that this expressive illocutionary act aims to express the speaker’s mental state about an event that is considered true. This is supported by Khodijah (2020), who states that expressive is an utterance expresses how the speaker feels about the situation. According to Yule (1996), expressive is a type of speech act that states what the listener feels, such as praising, apologizing, regretting, congratulating and others. Example:
“I’m really sorry!”

Direct Speech Act and Indirect Speech Act Direct Speech Acts

According to Searle (in Cutting, 2002), speakers who use direct speech want to communicate the literal meaning expressed by conventional words, or there is a direct

relationship between form (declarative, interrogative, and imperative) and function (statement, argument, command, or request). In other words, this direct speech act can be directly known and understood. So, when we speak directly, we have to check the utterance first, especially if the utterance is spoken to people we don't know very well. In addition, an utterance is considered a direct speech act if there is a direct relationship between the structured and communicative functions of the utterance. For example:

“I will come back tomorrow.”

This utterance is an illocutionary speech act, which is said to vary directly. It means that the speaker wants the listener to believe his word that he will be back tomorrow. Therefore, this direct speech illustrates a meaning the interlocutor can understand directly.

Indirect Speech Acts

An indirect Speech Act is an indirect action between the structure (imperative, declarative, question) and its function (ask, statement. Command/request), such as declarative speech acts used to make requests included in the indirect act. In addition, according to Searle (in Cutting, 2002), an indirect speech act is when someone uses indirect speech acts to communicate a meaning that is different from the actual meaning, and the form and function are not directly related. For example, the imperative form “Enjoy your bun” can be a statement function and means “I hope you enjoy your bun.” In addition, this indirect speech is related to politeness. This aligns with Yule's (1996) statement that indirect speech acts are generally associated with greater politeness in English than direct speech acts.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used a qualitative approach with descriptive methods. Qualitative research is an approach to understanding and studying human social problems (Creswell, 2014). This approach aims to observe and further understand the phenomena that occur in human activities, namely in communicating with others. In other words, this method obtains a complete picture and a deep understanding of language based on the phenomenon of conveying meaning in speech acts related to communication or interaction in human life. This is the subject matter of this research, which discusses Gordon Ramsay's comments to participants at Hell's Kitchen.

This study only investigates two episodes in season 21, namely Hell's Kitchen, episodes 1 and 2. The data source used in this study is a video taken from the Netflix streaming platform. The data was obtained from comments from Gordon Ramsay to participants in the form of conversations on the video. According to Kusumastuti and Khoiron (2019), in purposive sampling, the participants were selected based on pre-selected criteria based on the research questions.

In addition, the data was used to answer the research questions about the types of illocutionary acts and how to convey the illocutionary acts in Gordon Ramsay's commentary on Hell's Kitchen Season 21 Episodes 1-2. The data included in the illocutionary acts are 94 comments. Then, it will be categorized into illocutionary types based on Searle's theory (1979). After that, it is determined how the illocutionary act is conveyed, including direct or indirect speech acts. Then, the data is interpreted, and conclusions are drawn based on the findings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this part, the researcher will discuss the type of illocutionary act and the way illocutionary act are conveyed. The researcher will focus on illocutionary acts on Gordon Ramsay's comments in Hell's Kitchen Season 21 Episodes 1-2. Based on the analysis, the findings of the type and ways of conveying illocutionary acts obtained from Gordon Ramsay's comments in the Hell's Kitchen season 21 show are as follows.

Table 1. Type of Illocutionary Act

No	Type of Illocutionary Act	Numbers
1	Representative	36
2	Directive	20
3	Commissive	4
4	Expressive	29
5	Declarative	5
	Total	94

Based on Table 1, this study found the types of illocutionary acts present in Gordon Ramsay's comments in Hell's Kitchen. Specifically, this study revealed 36 data of representative acts, 29 data of expressive acts, 20 data of directive acts, 5 data of declarative acts, and 4 data commissive acts among Gordon Ramsay's comments. In addition, the representative is the most dominant type of illocutionary act, as found in 36 comments. This suggests that this type of speech act is used to express the speaker's assessment of the speech partner. Each of these is described below:

Representative

Datum 1:

{24:23-21}

Ramsay: "Let's be honest. Visually, it looks underwhelming, right?"

Ileana: "Yes, Chef"

Ramsay's comment datum 1 indicates a representative illocutionary at. His comment aims to express his opinion about the results of the cooking that Ileana has made. The utterance expresses this representative type: "Let's be honest." In his comment,

he mentioned what he believed about the results of Ileana's cooking. Thus, he stated that Ileana's cooking looked visually disappointing. This is based on Searle's (1979) statement that the assertive (representative) act binds the speaker to say something that happens, expressed through a truth proposition. This coincides with Siregar and Salsabila (2021), who mention that assertive speech acts are related to the truth of the speaker's speech.

Datum 2:

{21:38-31, episode 1 }

Ramsay: **“But you just said you kept it simple.** What did you do in 45 minutes if you didn't make pasta?”

Nichole: “Oh, um I made the sauce.”

Based on the datum, Ramsay's comment is included in the representative because Ramsay aims to complain. Assertive or representative speech is a form of utterance that confronts the speaker with the propositional truth expressed (Saraswati, 2022, p. 7). In the comment, "But you just said you kept it simple." the meaning of Ramsay's comment is that he is complaining that Nichole said she kept the meal simple, but she didn't make the pasta for the dish herself. So, Ramsay got annoyed and asked her what she was doing for 45 minutes if she didn't make the pasta.

Directive

Datum 1

{22:41-34, episode 1 }

Nichole: “So, I kept it really simple. It's a tagliatelle pasta with fresh burrata—”

Ramsay: **“Stop there,** ‘cause you get me going when you mention the word fresh.”

Nichole: “Okay”

Based on datum 1, Gordon Ramsay's comment belongs in the directive illocutionary act. The comment aims to command. The context of the comment is when Nichole explains her dish to Chef Ramsay, but Ramsay commands Nichole to stop. Ramsay's command speech is described as "Stop there." In his comment, Ramsay ordered Nichole to stop explaining and mentioning the word fresh in her dish because it did not match what Ramsay saw in Nichole's dish. Ultimately, Nichole stopped explaining and only responded "okay" to Chef Ramsay's command. This is based on Searle's theory (in Aleza et al., 2019), which states that a directive is a direction related to the speaker's attempt to make the speech partner do something.

Datum 2:

{13:28-13:23, episode 2 }

Ramsay: “Heard, Charlene? **Hey, you should be moving now, not staring at me.** Fuck me.”

Based on the datum, it shows that Gordon Ramsay's comment belongs to directive because it aims to command. According to Heriyanto and Garnida (2022), the directive is an utterance that intends to get the listener to do something. The context of the comment

was when Gordon mentioned the order for the VVIP guests, but Charlene did not hear paying attention and daydreaming. Thus, Chef Ramsay asked Cherlene, but Cherlene was confused. This made Chef Ramsay angry, and ordered her to move now and not look at him. As a result of the comment, Cherlene responded by immediately doing her job.

Commissive

Datum 1:

{29:55-29:36, episode 2}

Ramsay: "How did you cook them. Why are they so tough?"

Ileana: "Uh, I fried them and then finished them in the oven. But it didn't work in my favor exactly."

Ramsay: "**No, it definitely did not work in your favor.** Thank you."

Based on the conversation, Gordon Ramsay's comment is a commissive illocutionary act. In his comment, Ramsay aims to refuse Ileana's statement. According to Searle (1979), a commissive is an illocutionary act that aims to involve the listener in some future action, for example refusing. In line with Searle's statement, Furidha (2022) states that a commissive is a speech act performed in the future. In his explanation, Ileana mentioned that she cooked her chicken wings by frying them, and for the final step, she grilled the wings. However, it didn't work because the flavour of the chicken wings was still lacking. Based on this explanation, he commented and rejected Ileana's explanation that what she did really didn't work.

Datum 2:

{12:40-12:24, Episode 1}

Ramsay: "**It's not VIP. It feels like general admission. It's not supposed to be that sweet.** Man, this is tough. You need one to tie and two to win."

The datum 2 shows that Ramsay's comment contains a commissive illocutionary act. Ramsay's comment aims to refuse something. His comment occurred because Ramsay refused a statement from one of the participants, Sommer, who said that his nickname at work was VIP, but it was inversely proportional to his stewed salmon dish. Thus, he commented, "It's not VIP. It feels like general admission." This comment means that he says his stewed salmon is not VIP but like general admission (a category below VIP). It can be concluded that he refused the VIP title that Sommer had. In addition, he also believed that the taste of the rice isn't sweeter. This is supported by the statement of Cutting and Fordyce (2001), which states that commissive includes actions where words bind the speaker to perform future actions, such as refusing.

Expressive

Datum 1:

{15:35-15:27, episode 1}

Ramsay: "**Fish is cooked beautifully. It's got that really nice citrus, 'cause you caramelized that and laid it on top.** Mum's Spanish rice. Slightly bland."

Abe: "Mom's gonna kill me for that one."

Based on this datum, Gordon Ramsay's comment is expressive because the speaker aims to praise Abe's dish. In addition, Vandervaken (in Salsabila & Setyaji, 2021) states that praising someone expresses approval of something (prepositional content condition). Based on this, Ramsay's comment on Abe's dish was a compliment to him because, in his comment, Ramsay praised the fish that Abe cooked beautifully, and the taste of caramelized oranges made Abe's dish quite impressive.

Datum 2:

{25:41, episode 1}

Ramsay: "**Love this.**"

Based on datum 2, Gordon Ramsay's comment belongs to the illocutionary expressive act because the utterance shows Ramsay's feelings. The context of the comment is that Ramsay tasted the dish that Brett had served. After tasting the dish, Ramsay praised the dish and said that he liked the dish served by Brett by commenting, "Love this.". This is based on Yule's statement (1996), which states that expressive is a speech act that states what the speaker feels.

Declarative

Datum 1:

{19:22, episode 1}

Ramsay: "**Five.**"

Vlad: "Thank you, Chef."

The datum above shows that Ramsay's comment is included in the declarative illocutionary act because his comment can change Vlad's situation. In his comment, he gives five points, which is highest point. This point changes Vlad's situation and makes him superior to his opponent. In addition, the explanation is based on Searle (1997), which says that declarative speech is an expression that brings about change in the world. In this case, Vlad's world or situation changed because of Gordon Ramsay's comment.

Datum 2

{33:01-32:43, episode 2}

Ramsay: "So, Red Team is between Alejandro or Cheyenne. Two really good dishes. Um... I'm gonna award this to the individual that had gumption to give me something I've never seen before. **And those wings belong to... Alejandro.** Congratulations. Well done."

Based on the datum, Gordon Ramsay's comment is a declarative illocutionary act. Declarative is an action that causes an instantaneous change in some current state (Sidik et al., 2022, p. 66). In this comment, Ramsay aims to announce. Ramsay's comment above points out that Ramsay evaluated Alejandro and Cheyenne's dishes, the winning candidates in the chicken wing challenge. After evaluating their dishes, Ramsay announced the winner of the challenge. In the end, Ramsay announced that the winner of the wing challenge was Alejandro. Based on Ramsay's assessment, Alejandro is the

winner, and he gets the benefit of being free from punishment. This changed Alejandro's situation because he could use the benefit when his team lost and was free from punishment.

Table 2. The Ways Illocutionary Act are Conveyed

No	The Ways Illocutionary Act are Conveyed	Numbers
1	Direct Speech Act	73
2	Indirect Speech Act	21
	Total	94

After being analyzed, it was found that Gordon Ramsay's comments included 73 data on direct speech acts and 21 data on indirect speech acts. Therefore, the delivery of illocutionary acts is more often conveyed by direct speech acts because the meaning of the speech is expressed clearly. Each of which is described below.

Direct Speech Act

Datum 1:

{26:35-26:29, episode 1}

Ramsay: **“Uh, I'd like to say tonight your bangers and mash are bang on.** That's very strong four. Good job”

Zeus: “Thanks so much, Chef.”

Based on the conversation, Gordon Ramsay conveyed his comment using a direct illocutionary act because it was declarative, which stated that the banger and mash were good that night. In other words, his comment explicitly states the meaning of his speech by its structural form. Yule (in Furidha & Brylialfi, 2022) said that whenever there is a direct relationship between structure and function, it is called a direct speech act.

Datum 2:

{24:23-21, episode 2}

Ramsay: **“Let's be honest.** Visually, it looks underwhelming, right?”

Ileana: “Yes, Chef”

Based on the datum, Gordon Ramsay's comment on Ileana is described by the utterance, "Let's be honest.". The comment is delivered as direct speech act because Ramsay aims to convey his opinion. This is based on Ramsay wanting to give his honest judgment to Ileana. This refers to Wahidah (2022), which states that utterances whose meaning is explicitly known are called direct utterances.

Indirect Speech Act

Datum 1:

{19:34-19:30, episode 2}

Ramsay: **“You're supposed to be the twentysomething, not the slowest.”**

Red team: "Yes, Chef"

Datum 1 shows that Ramsay conveyed his command indirectly in his comment to the red team. In the comment, "You're supposed to be the twentysomething, not the slowest." This comment is a declarative action that functions as a command. In Ramsay's comment, he told the red team to move faster according to their twenty-something age. Based on this, indirect speech acts convey what others say, but without using the actual words (Mansyur, 2019, p. 17).

Datum 2:

{ 17:32- 17:29, episode 1)

Ramsay: "Why are you laughing? **I gotta taste it.**"

Cheyenne: "Uh, I've never had anything like that."

In the conversation. Gordon Ramsay's comment, "I gotta taste it." It is clearly spoken indirectly because there is another meaning that Ramsay wants to convey. Ramsay's comment is in the form of a declaration but he commands Cheyenne to stop laughing because he will try the dish. According to Mansyur (2019), an indirect speech act is an utterance that has an indirect relationship between the form and function of the utterance.

CONCLUSION

This research found five of the illocutionary acts proposed by Searle (1979) in Gordon Ramsay's Commentary in Hell's Kitchen Season 21 Episodes 1-2. The total data found in this research are 94 data. There are 36 data of representative, 29 data of expressive, 20 data of directive, 5 data of declarative, and 4 data of commissive. The most types of illocutionary acts found in Gordon Ramsay's comments are representative. This happens because speakers usually say or state their judgment either on dish, attitude, or participant's skills based on facts and truths that speakers believe in their judgment. In contrast, the least used type is commissive because Gordon Ramsay rarely promises something to the participants in his comments. Gordon Ramsay emphasizes commissive acts to reject and agree with the opinions of his participants.

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, related to the second question. Gordon Ramsay's comments in Hell's Kitchen season 21 episodes 1-2 use more direct speech acts (73 data) than indirect speech acts (21 data). This is because the comments spoken by Gordon Ramsay tend to be to the point, and the meaning he wants to convey to the listeners is directly revealed. This is based on the characteristics of his well-known emotional and sarcastic utterances. Therefore, Gordon Ramsay's comments to Hell's Kitchen participants seem frontal.

Based on the research results and discussion presented, the researcher realizes there are still many areas for improvement in this research. The suggestion that the researcher wants to convey to future researchers is that future researchers are expected to find new cases of the same study but different objects, such as podcasts, speeches, vlogs,

newspapers and general conversation. Another suggestion is that researchers interested in studying speech acts, especially illocutionary acts, can use supporting theories other than Searle used by researchers to enrich knowledge in many theories.

In addition, researchers can use other interesting topics about speech acts, such as perlocutionary acts. This topic discusses the effect or response of the listener to the speaker's utterance, which can be used on objects similar or different from this research. Furthermore, the researcher hopes this research can add insight into speech acts and become reference material for English literature students examining illocutionary acts.

References

- Adhi Kusumastuti, A. M. K. (2019). *MOTEDEPENELITIANKUALITATIF*. Semarang: Lembaga pendidikan Sukarno Pressindo.
- Alreza, E. R., Natsir, M., & Valiantien, N. M. (2019). an Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Yes, We Can Speech By Barack Obama. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 3(1), 25-34.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford At The Clarendon Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *RESEARCH DESIGN: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge, 59.
- DBK, Admin. (2016). LASTING IMPACT: Hell's Kitchen. *The Diamondback*. https://dbknews.com/2016/08/12/article_a802cdd2-b1f1-11e2-85c6-0019bb30f31a-html/
- Fordyce, J. C. and K. (2021). *Pragmatics*. New york: Routledge.
- Grundy, P. (2019). *Doing pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Heriyanto, A. I., & Garnida, S. C. (2022). AN ANALYSIS ILLOCUTIONARY ACT IN THE MONSTER HOUSE MOVIE. 81-89.
- Herman, A. (2020). Illocutionary acts in Trump's speech of 2020 American President general election campaign in Toledo Ohio (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung).
- Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics (2nd Edition)*. In *Oxford University* (Vol. 35, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2015.1046205>
- Iskandarsyah Siregar, Salsabila. (2021). Acts of Illocutionary Speech by Ganjar Pranowo in the "One Hour Closer" Talkshow. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities Studies*, 7(1), 95-100. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijahs.2021.L1.14>
- Khodijah, S. (2020). Illocutionary Act in Political Debate. *Journal of Language Intelligence and Culture*, 2(2), 141-158. <https://doi.org/10.35719/jlic.v2i2.39>
- Kreidler, C. (2013). *Introducing English Semantics*. In *Introducing English Semantics*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315886428>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics* (Vol. 21, Issue 1). Cambridge University Press. <http://journal.um-surabaya.ac.id/index.php/JKM/article/view/2203>
- R. M. (2019). An analysis of directive illocutionary act in Coco Movie by Lee Unkrich (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung).
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics - an introduction*. In *Corpus Linguistics for Pragmatics* (pp. 1-15). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429451072-1>
- Nur, T. I., & Simatupang, E. C. M. (2022). Illocutionary acts in the Film cruella by craig gillespie: A pragmatics study. *Budapest International Research and Critics*

- Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 5(3), 19697-19707.
- Rahmi, N., Gani, S. A., & Fauzia Sari, D. (2023). An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Prince Harry's Interview. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 5(3), 132-141. <https://jim.usk.ac.id/READ/article/viewFile/27601/12824>
- Salma Citra Kamila Saraswati, Sumani, & Tri Wahyuni Chasanatun. (2022). The Analysis of Expressive Illocutionary Acts in the Final Shows of The Ellen DeGeneres Show. *ELITICS: Proceedings of Seminar in English Education, Literature, and Linguistics*, 7,7-13. <http://prosiding.unipma.ac.id/index.php/EDULITICS/article/view/2717>
- Salsabila, L., & Setyaji, A. (2021). *Expressive Illocutionary Acts Analysis of Donald Trump's Remarks on COVID-79 Pandemic in Press Briefing*. 242-251.
- Searle. (1969). An essay in the philosophy of language. *Historical Pragmatics*, 16.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression And Meaning* (1st ed., Vol. 21, Issue 1). Cambridge University Press. <http://journal.um-surabaya.ac.id/index.php/JKM/article/view/2203>
- Sidik, A. P., Priyawan, P., & Ardiansyah, E. A. (2022). Illocutionary Acts and Representative. Function on English Speeches Youtube Channel. *PARADIGM: Journal of Language and Literary Studies*,5(1),63-74. <https://doi.org/10.18860/prdg.v5i1.15806>
- Siahaan, Sanggam. 2008. Issues in Linguistics. Yogyakarta: GrahaIlmu.
- Putri, R. A., Sartini, N. W., & Fajri, M. S. Al. (2020). The analysis of illocutionary acts of judges' comments in America's next top model and Asia's next top model competitions: A cross-cultural pragmatic study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(4), 1885-1898. <https://doi.org/10.17263/JLLS.851015>
- Wahidah, A. S. N. A. (2022). Assertive act in Elon Musk's talk about future, Artificial Intelligence (AI), and Mars at 2017 World Government Summit in Dubai (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung).
- Wahyu Furidha, B. (2022). Illocutionary Act of Michelle Obama Speech on YouTube Video. *SUJANA: Journal of Education and Learning Review*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Ward, L. K. H. and G. (2006). The Handbook of Pragmatics. In *Blackwell Publishing* (Vol. 2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110589443-002> Wolfram Bublitz, N. R. N. (2011). *Fondations of Pragmatics*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruter Mouton
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New york: Oxford University Press.