

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter gives complete of background, research question, objective of research and significance of research. Therefore, the research fundamental and main line can be discovered.

1.1 Background

Pragmatics in 21st century interests in the three major field, intercultural, cognitive and social pragmatics. When intercultural pragmatics focus on the phenomena of interlocutors who have different first language and culture, communicate (speaking-listening, writing-reading) in common language (Kecskes. 2014); whereas cognitive pragmatics concern on cooperative activity among the interlocutors consciously and intentionally construct or create the meaning of their interaction (Bara, 2010); and social pragmatics as known now as *sociopragmatics* significantly to elaborate how the social and cultural factors are carried out in language practice and how they (social – cultural) influence the linguistics forms in specific communicative context (Andersen & Aijmer, 2011).

Reasonably, the major field of pragmatics above become the focus of the discussion among the linguists because the flow of communication in this era is unlike from the previous. Apart from the influence of sophisticated technology that effect how easy and fast the information is exchanged as known as industrial revolutionary, recently there lots of element faze the interlocutors' linguistics performance such as the various background of people across the countries (today

it is known as a global community), higher standard of daily needs, personal branding and development, massive migration and do intermarrying, elite global policies and global trade. Those influence the people way of delivering the ideas, opinions, critics verbally. As a field that study of the way in which language is used to express what something means in particular situation or in another words as a study of what the speaker means, pragmatics obviously reveal the actual and purpose of communication. Richard and Schmidt (2010), pragmatics is the study of the use of language in communication, particularly the relationships between sentences and the contexts and situations in which they are used. Pragmatics includes the study of: (a) how the interpretation and use of utterances depends on knowledge of the real-world; (b) how speakers use and understand speech acts; (c) how the structure of sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

Related to this study, Pakaya (2017, p.30) in his dissertation, there are three proposition elements that always becoming the goals of the speaker or writer means and differ each part of their utterance belong to, (1) the background knowledge, (2) foreground, and (3) digression. Deeper, background knowledge can be indicated by several scientific proves, academic references, latest studies/news/science and humanity phenomena when it comes up to tighten the argument. To notice the foreground, it belongs to main theme or the topic/idea of speech, discussion, even each sub-point of the content when the speaker of writer delivers the utterances in spoken or written form. Then digression means when the

utterances depart from the main subject or each references the speaker or writer used.

Speech Act is one of the pragmatics' branches of study or one of basic notions and it is concern to the production or issuance of a sentence token under certain conditions. Speech act is the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication as well. The speech act or acts perform in the utterance of a sentence are in general function of the meaning of the sentence. The meaning of a sentence does not in all cases uniquely determine what speech act is performed in a given utterance of that sentence, for a speaker may mean more than what he/she actually says, but it is always in principle possible for him to say exactly what he means. Therefore, it is in principle possible for every speech act one performs or can perform to be uniquely determined by giving sentence (or set of sentences), giving the assumptions that the speaker is speaking literally and that the context is appropriate.

*I welcome all of you with the Islamic greeting,
 "Asslamu 'alaikum waarhmatullahi wabarakatuh", may peace,
 mercy, and blessing of Allah SWT of almighty God be on all of
 you.*

This example shows the Commissive, it commits the speakers to some future action as Searle's theory. In this utterances, Mr. Zakir Naik would like to gather every person/audience in that event to feel overwhelming blessed by Islamic greeting which cover all human being, also in order to unite them all feel close to

the further content of his speech. The people may feel the linguistics tendency is used by him in the opening section of that seminar.

Zakir Naik is known as a Muslim modern scholar or lecturer which linguistically comprehend the Arabic, Urdu, English and Sanskrit, means he well studied the Holy Qur'an, Bible, and Veda. This research finds his appropriateness to fit in, by considering he can deliver and transfer the content/information of his speeches in every different topic to a big number and multicultural audiences that most attend in his seminar/event across the nations understandably, where for another speaker or even a scholar generally is challenging and difficult moreover if the topics relate to the belief. "Islam and 21st Century", the title of his speech that has been delivering in the performance or the show that happened because of collaboration between Peace TV (his own tv station which present Islamic way of life programs) and Oxford United Union, United Kingdom (world widely) become the source of data of this research. This speech is uploaded in YouTube platform on December 13, 2014. The content of his speech most about the correlation of Holy Qur'an and modern scientific proof.

Before going further, there have been some studies conducted in relation to analyse Dr Zakir Naik speech and another Islamic preacher or extraordinary known well people, for example: (1) Silvia (2016) entitled *Speech Act Analysis of Dr. Zakir Naik's Speeches*; (2) Nida (2017) with *An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Dr. Zakir Naik's Speech in Open Debate at Oxford Union*; (3) Ladika (2018) by *The Analysis of Figurative Language used by Zakir Naik*; (4) Ismail (2017) presented *A Rhetorical Analysis of Selected Speech of Dr. Zakir Naik*; (5)

Zamzuardi and Ermanto (2018) *The Rhetoric of Persuasion of Ustadz Abdul Somad: Discourse Analysis in the Media YouTube*; (6) Zahara and Syarif (2019) by *Comparative Analysis of Speech and Thought Presentation in Islamic Preach between Zakir Naik and Syeikh Khalid Yasin*; (7) Wang (2010) with *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches*; (8) Wardoyo, et all (2017) presented *Theo-linguistic Study of Directive Speech Acts Performed by Islamic Preacher in Friday Sermon in Bandung Indonesia*; and (9) Al-Qaysi (2019) in his research *Linguistic Analysis of Obama's Speech: Ending the War in Iraq*.

Specifically, in each of them to become the gap to this research, Hartini (2016) used Searle's theory in categorizing the speech act (representative, directive, expressive, commissive and declaration) then its function of each type belonged to Finnegan's theory. While Nida (2017), she specified his work in illocutionary act (speech act by Austin. Even Austin provides his theory in three subdivisions of speech act (locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary act) somehow, Nida used one type only. Next to the Ladika's (2018) research, it focused on the figurative language which mean metaphor, simile, personification, hyperbole, metonymy, and synecdoche. Then, rhetorical analysis conducted by Ismail (2017) for his dissertation look further the rhetoric, logical modes (logos), emotional modes (pathos), and ethical modes (ethos). Additionally, Zamzuardi and Ermanto (2018) with their rhetoric of persuasion by a popular Indonesian Islamic preacher, Ustadz Abdul Somad, the theory that they used is Aristotle's theory and is reinforced by Searle's illocutionary speech act theory. They found the sentence techniques used by Ustadz Abdul Somad, they were direct persuasion, such as; (inversive

sentence); (2) indirect persuasion, such as (declarative and interrogative); (3) the use of figurative language, such as: (rhetoric, metaphor, cynicism, tautology, hyperbole, sinism, simile, and anti-climax). While in another group of researchers, Zahara and Syarif (2019) conducted the comparative analysis speech and thought between two famous Islamic preachers, Zakir Naik and Syeikh Khlaid Yasin. Their work would like to elaborate the stylistic of both preachers or the modes and the similarities and differences of those two speakers in spreading the teaching of Muhammad (PBUH) to the public. They figure out that the modes of speech and thought presentation used by these two preachers is mostly similar in several high number occurrence is narrator's presentation of voice and it is found that Zakir Naik mostly used speech presentation rather than Khalid Yasin. Step to Wardoyo, et al (2017) in their Theo-linguistic Study of Directive Speech Acts Performed by Islamic Preacher in Friday Sermon in Bandung Indonesia, they sharply explain deeper about one of the Searle's theory of illocutionary act, Directive. Their study found the strategy of directive speech acts happened in Friday Sermon in *Kota Kembang* or *City of Flower* mostly used suffix "lash" and "kan" also has higher number among the finding data. The directive speech acts strategy using inclusive pronoun "kita" indicates that *khatib* or preacher shows the politeness principle. The strategy of directive speech acts use prohibition words also has quite high number. *Khatib* asked the audience or *jema'ah* to fear God, be thankful, always remember and pray to God. *Khatib* also supported his argument with Quranic verses and prophetic tradition. Lastly, Wang (2010) and Al-Qaysi (2019) did study in Barack Obama's speeches. If Wang composed the study in discourse file,

in order to account for political discourse like the public speech, when Obama got response from the audiences. Wang used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theory and Systematic Functional Linguistics, by focusing to transitivity and modality. Whereas, Al-Qaysi conducted his research in Linguistic Analysis of Obama's Speech: Ending the War in Iraq. He focused to the phonetics, phonology, syntax (genitive) and pragmatics. His study used Quirk and Green Baum (1990) theory for the sentence (structure) types, used Cutting's (2005) for the social aspects, Finegan's theory (2006) for the speech act. Hence, his study found out that president Barack Obama used simple sentences and parallelism to create the feeling of importance. Also, he used conscience of demonstratives to refer to the removal of his troops from Iraq. Moreover, Obama were found use directive speech act types many times to reflect his responsibility of ending the war in Iraq.

Hartini's and this research has similar theory, Searle's however, this research extends to Jaszcolt (*verdictive and excersitive*) theory as well to broaden the study. Another similarity of work comes up in source of data to Nida's. What Nida uses in her study is *Open Debate at Oxford Union*, is was the full version of the event, the speech, "Islam and 21st Century" is a part of it. Then after Zakir Naik delivered his speech. "Islam and 21st Century", it continued by the question-and-answer session which is also include in this study. However, Nida only uses one type of speech act (Illocutionary act) whereas this research uses the Searle's theory in categorizing the speech act (representative, directive, expressive, commissive and declaration) and Jaszcolt (*verdictive and excersitive*). Other that,

this study also elaborates the extension of speech act in the flow of Zakir Naik speech performance.

Another astonishing studies which have been conducting by Zamzuardi and Ermanto (2018) about the rhetoric of persuasion, Zahara and Syarif (2019) in comparative analysis, Wardoyo, et all. (2017) for the theo-linguistics study to several Islamic preachers, and Junling Wang (2010) with critical discourse analysis also Fouad Hussein Al-Qaysi (2019) in Linguistic analysis for Obama can be the best supporting elements to build up this frame of study.

Considering the unique and eligible linguistics performance of Mr. Naik in his speech “Islam and 21st Century” and the gap of study from those study above, this study is worthy to be conducted.

1.2 Research Question

The research questions of this research are

1. How does Dr Zakir Naik arrange his speech?
2. What are the types of speech act that used in Zakir Naik’s speech “*Islam and 21st Century*”?

1.3 Objective of Research

This research aims to explain the speech arrangement and types of speech act contains in “*Islam and 21st Century*” by Zakir Naik.

1.4 Significance of Research

This research is expected to inform linguistically the reader about the use of speech act that contain in “*Islam and 21st Century*” which performs by Zakir Naik. Standing for the noteworthy work, by conducting this research, it contributes to the comprehension of pragmatics field teaching for the English Education Department, particularly the speech act. Therefore, it will become one of the references for increasing the understanding of linguistics parts or element which play big role in communication. Furthermore, this work might be beneficial for other researchers who will undertake the linguistic research particularly the study of speech act, the pragmatic area.