

Speech Act of a Person with Mental Disorders: *A Clinical Pragmatic Analysis*

Husni Thamrin
English Literature
Universitas Pasundan
Bandung Indonesia
husnithamrin@unpas.ac.id

Abstract—This research was to determine the speech acts of speaking dialogue in person with a mental disorder (schizophrenia) in terms of clinical pragmatic perspectives. This study is conducted qualitatively with identification and classification in the form of speech acts of the person with pragmatic disorders. Data were obtained in the interview from a thirty-year-old male who has suffered from a mental illness due to the influence of heavy alcohol and drugs. The selection of the participant is to find out about speech disorder that is reduced at that age level. The results of the speech act from the participant showed the sentences that indicate assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and, declarative. All speech acts and sentences have a certain meaning and interpretation correlated with mental illness and the language deficit of the person specifically.

Keywords: *speech acts, mental disorder, clinical pragmatics, language deficit*

I. INTRODUCTION

The beginning of Clinical Pragmatics occurs due to communication disorder that happen between humans which causes a lack of understanding about purpose of the speech spoken by the speaker because of the grammar of the speech sentence that is not systematic and difficult for listeners to understand (Cummings, 2016; Taylor & Whitehouse, 2016; Bosco, Berardineli, & Parola, 2019; Gabbatore, Bosco, Makinen, Ebeling, Hurtig, & Loukus, 2019; Toki, Fakitsa, Drosos, Pange, Siafaka, Karampas, & Petrikis, 2018). Four main communication processes are important for producing speech: a) the genesis of the mind; the main source of ideas originating from the brain to be represented in speech form; b) encoding language is a way that is used to emphasize the process of a series of words and sentences through the organs of human speech; c) motor programming; and d) motor execution (Massaro, 2001; Gillam, Marquardt, 2019; & Salleta, 2018). In short, we have many forms of thought that were previously communicated in the form of speech. It can be understood when the communication process that occurs between the speaker and listener that has been described in the communication process of pragmatic disorders (schizophrenia) language in communication between the two parties who do not understand each other, then it is clear cognitively experiencing language errors that include clinical pragmatics about language disorders.

According to Cummings (2009), schizophrenia is the most common and most serious mental disorder, affecting one in a

hundred people so it is called crazy in people's views. Schizophrenia is a psychotic disorder characterized by major disturbances in emotional thoughts, and disturbing thoughts, in which various thoughts are not logically interconnected; wrong perception and attention; flat or inappropriate effect; and various bizarre activity disorders. Patients withdraw from many people and reality, often into a fantasy life full of delusions and hallucinations (Mitchell & Crow, 2005; Davidson, 2012; Bosco, Parola, Sacco, Zettin, & Angeleri, 2017; Bosco & Parola, 2018; Weiser, 2019; Reginsson, Ingason, Euesden, Bjornsdottir, Olafsson, Sigurdsson, ... & Steinberg, 2018; Riglin, Collishaw, Richards, Thapar, Rice, Maughan, & Thapar, 2018; Petrey, 2018). It can be seen that currently pragmatic deficits in schizophrenics have been widely studied in recent years. Pragmatics emerged in the 1960s. The people who first introduced pragmatics were Ross and Lakoff. However, significant developments regarding pragmatics were developed by philosophers. The philosophers who were at the same time pragmatics of the early days were Austin (1962), Searle (1969), and Grice (1975). In America, the work of the philosopher Austin (1962) and his student Searle (1969, 1975), inspired many pragmatic developments. Austin's work is considered a pragmatic pioneer entitled How to Do Things with Words (Austin, 1962; Jucker, Schneider, & Bublitz 2018; Ilie & Neal, 2018; Carroll, 2019; Ninio & Catherine, 2018; Tulgar, 2018; Taguchi, 2018). In the work, Austin put forward his ideas about performative and constative speech. Another important idea is about acts of locution, illocution, perlocution, and the power of speech illocution. Some other pragmatic thinkers, namely: Searle (1969) developed Austin's thought. He coined the theory of speech acts that are considered very important in pragmatic studies. According to Brasdefer (2019), Searle has proposed speech acts based on meaning and function into five types, namely: representative, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. Searle states that in practice there are three kinds of speech acts, including (a) locutionary acts, (b) Illocutionary acts, (c) Perlocutionary act (Searle, 1969; Searle, Kiefer, & Bierwisch, 1980; Searle, 1999; Burkhard, 1990; Malmkjer, 2006; Sbisa, 2009; Sbisa, 2018; Grewendorf & Meggle, 2002; Fogal, Harris, & Moss, 2018). A locutionary act is an act of speaking with words, phrases, and sentences by the meaning contained by those words, phrases, and sentences. This sentence can be referred to as the act of saying something. So, the words "my hands are itchy" for example,

are merely meant to inform the speech partner that when the speech is raised, the hands of the speaker are in an itchy state.

Searle divides speech acts into five, this type of speech act will then be expressed through illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. An illocutionary act is an act of doing something with a specific purpose and function as well. This speech act can be said as the act of doing something. The words "my hands itch" spoken by the speaker are not solely intended to inform the speech partner that at the time the speech is spoken, itching is lodged in the hands of the speaker, but more than that the speaker wants the speech partner to take certain actions related to the itching of the speaker's hands. A perlocutionary act is an act of growing influence (effect) to the speech partner. This speech act is called the act of affecting someone. Speech "my hands itch", for example, can be used to foster the influence (effect) of fear to the speech partner. Furthermore, Searle classifies the illocutionary speech acts into five kinds of speech forms, each of which has a communicative function. The five forms of speech that indicate the function can be summarized as follows:

- 1) *Assertive* that is, the form of speech that binds the speaker to the truth of the proposition being expressed, for example stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, and claiming.
- 2) *Directive* that is, the form of speech in which the speech is intended to make an influence so that the speech partner takes action, for example, ordering (commanding), commanding, requesting, advising, and recommending (recommending).
- 3) *Expressive* is a form of speech that serves to express or show the psychological attitude of the speaker of a situation, for example thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, praising, and condoling.
- 4) *Commissive* the form of speech that serves to declare promises or offers, for example, promising (promising), vowed (vowing), and offering something (offering)
- 5) *Declarative* is the form of speech that connects the contents of the speech with reality, for example, surrender (resigning), dismiss (dismissing), baptizing (christening), giving a name (naming), lift (appointing), exclude (ex-communication), and punishing (sentencing).

It can be understood from the explanation of Searle speech acts is a speech act theory based on the speaker, where the focus of attention is on how speakers realize the intention in speaking; instead, Searle sees speech acts based on the listener, namely how the listener responds to the utterance, that is, how he guesses the intended use of the speaker using certain utterances.

Related to clinical pragmatic studies, several previous studies have examined this area such as a study about development of pragmatic disorders as a cognitive impairment of language inherited from birth to adulthood (Airenti, 2017), a study about aspects of pragmatic disorders (Snow, 2017), language disorder (Coman, 2018), disruption of pragmatics in adulthood (Jagoe, 2017), right-hemisphere pragmatic disorders (Blake, 2017). Moreover, the ability of patients with

Schizophrenia to comprehend and produce sincere, deceitful, and ironic communicative intentions (Bosco, 2019), pragmatic deficits uttered by schizophrenics (Suryani, 2015), pragmatic language disorder in Parkinson's disease and the potential effect of cognitive reserve (Montemurro, Mondini, Signorini, Marchetto, Bambini, & Arcara, 2019). The psychosocial aspects of pragmatic disorders focused on aspects of social psychology that affect the pragmatic disorders of one's language also have been studied (Swineford, Thurm, Baird, Wetherby, & Swedo, 2014). However, in writer's knowledge, there is no research has been found related to mental disorders of perception in schizophrenics in terms of pragmatic perspective specifically in Bandung, West Java. Hence, the focus of this study is to analyze the speech acts of a person with a mental disorder from the perspective of pragmatic analysis.

II. METHOD

This research uses descriptive qualitative and quantitative procedures in the form of conversational analysis aimed at finding the accuracy of the language data. Participants who were involved in the interview were 1 person with a 30-years adult age level (1 male) who suffered from a mental illness disorder that was not a congenital disease because of the influence of heavy alcohol and drugs. The selection of participants is to find out about speech disorder that is reduced at that age level. While the research location is in the area of Sukahaji, Bandung, West Java. There are three stages carried out in this study to analyze the conversation data. The first step is to identify all forms of data in conversations that indicate sentences that are categorized as assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative in conversation, and this is done qualitatively based on pragmatic theory. The second stage is to classify the type of speech act emergence based on theory. The third step is to sort the conversation sentence data into Searle speech act categories to determine the tendency of Searle-based conversation sentences, do data analysis, review, and discuss it.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents data on the findings of various forms of speech acts spoken by a person who suffers from a pragmatic deficit. The description of findings based on research data were categorized into five forms, they are; a) assertive has two forms; b) directive has three forms; c) expressive has one form; d) commissive has one form, and e) declarative has one form. The specific explanation and description of the data can be seen by representatives of the speech act discussed below.

1. Form of assertive data

Data: 1

..kunaon ak nyak, hirup aing teh ripuh !	.. I don't know why my life is so miserable!
--	--

From Tabel I, the person complains that why his life is miserable poor and regrets his existence in this world was

born to be a miserable person, so much trouble that he felt injustice when he saw people who dress well, rich have luxury vehicles when compared to his miserable self and suffer from. The sentence is categorized as complaining because that person starts with the word 'why' that means unsatisfied of existence his life in this world and then followed by his life condition 'my life is poor' is not shame with others. He just thinks that what he wants to do or get is not like other people that's easy to do or get anything that they want. In short, he speaks of his complaining in this life and blames his family without straight to the point that he has regretted being born as poor people in this real world.

Data: 2

<i>.. ak, meser gas henteu!</i>	<i>..ak, do you want to buy gas!</i>
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

From Data 2, the person to give suggestions to buy gas by gallon. He offers himself to give a hand. From his sentence of offering something to suggest to buy gas by gallon, it means he just reminds if the gas of the listener has up and must be changed to a new one. So, the person that asks him to buy gas, as a result, will give him some money. Another interpretation, it can be just the way that he needs some money by suggesting buying gas as a result that he needs some money to buy something like a soft drink or cigarette that he used to buy. Although, he has suffered from language deficit or pragmatic disorder he is still shame and polite to the people he knows around his environment, especially his neighborhood.

2. Form of directive data

Data: 3

<i>.. ak.. hasem..rokok heula euy!</i>	<i>my mouth feels bitter, (give me) cigarette!</i>
--	--

In the example of the directive Data 3, the person asks directly without doing a small talk to ask for cigarettes from the cigars, this is because his cognitive thinking disorder has a pragmatic deficit so that it goes directly to the object he wants. The sentences that he spoke is categorized as a requesting. We can see from the words '*rokok heula euy!*'. It has the meaning of begging/requesting something to someone that he knows well. However, it could also be that the person already knows his cypress who is a neighbor around the neighborhood he lives.

Data: 4

<i>..ma, nyandak rokok dua bayar nya!</i>	<i>Mom, I took two cigarettes, pay them!</i>
---	--

In the example of directive Data 4, the person orders or command his mother directly to pay two cigarettes that he has taken from the retailer. The sentences that he spoke is categorized as a command. We can analyze from the words '*bayar nya*'(pay them). It means the cigarettes will be paid by his mother. It has the meaning of commanding something to someone that he knows well. However, it could not happen to someone that he doesn't know very well. Because of sentences that he has if he speaks to other people, sometimes it doesn't understand by people around him.

Data: 5

<i>.juk, dek ke mama taroskeun, bisi ulahen meser kopi.</i>	Please bro..ask Mom, if it is forbidden to buy coffee.
---	--

In the example of the directive Table V, the person asks his brother to ask permission to his mother about to do things, such as buying a coffee. The sentence which is categorized as a recommendation. We can know from the words '*juk dek ke mama*' (please bro ask mom). It has meaning to suggest or recommend by their mother while buying coffee. He is afraid of his mother if he has mistaken to buy something, like a coffee.

3. Form of expressive data

Data: 6

<i>..enya. sabatang rokok we...nuhun ak..hi..hi.</i>	<i>..ok, only one cigarette.. thanks bro..hi..hi.</i>
--	---

In the example of expressive Data 6, the person expresses his gratitude for being given a cigarette. He feels very happy with the expression of his laugh which expressed by 'hi..hi'. This is because he does not have money to buy cigarettes and happens to accidentally see someone he knows without hesitation asking for a cigarette so that spontaneously says thank you to those who have given him cigarettes. It categorizes as a form of thanks to someone that helps him by giving one stick of cigarette.

4. Form of commissive data

Data: 7

<i>..enya. ngke runtah dipicen mung pasian dua rebu ..</i>	<i>..ok, I will be throw away the garbage if you give me two thousands rupiah..</i>
--	---

In the example of commissive Data 7, the person promises to throw away the garbage with one condition to give him some money as a result of his helping to clean the garbage into the right place. The commissive sentence can be seen from the words '*ngke runtah dipicen mung*' (I will be throw away the garbage if). The person states to do the thing if there is an advantage for his duty to clean the garbage.

5. Form of declarative data

Data: 8

<i>..moal ah sien kaluar aya' pulisi</i>	<i>.. no, I'm afraid to go out in case there is the police</i>
--	--

In the example of the declarative Data 8, the person stated the speaker to stay at home and did not want to go out because he was afraid of the figure of a police officer, this could be because the patient had several times dealt with the police because of drug and drug cases that caused him to experience interference pragmatic schizophrenia which is categorized as acquiring pragmatic disorders.

From the analysis of the data above, based on the category of speech acts based on Searle. In the speech acts of patient/person with schizophrenia, four categories meet the theory of Searle. This could be due to damage to cognitive reasoning that cannot make the conversation sentence in commissive form rightly due to a pragmatic deficit in the storehouse of language (brain) that he has. There must be

something damage to his neural system on his brain that causes the impact of alcohol or drug-addicted that he has consumed annually. So, without realizing that can bring language deficit such as; hard to think about the real situation in life that he must face to survive, to work hard, and to speak in a good manner. The real impact of language disorder that suffered from schizophrenia is lazy to utter with hard thinking, get rid of the social community around him, feeling shy if people talk to him, and always laughing and talking to himself with high hallucination. While we try to speak with him by using formal language, he often doesn't understand and always makes repetition by saying 'what' that means he just listen but he is busy with his hallucination by talking right here and there without the clear topic of speaking. However, this patient/person can be cured by conversational therapy based on clinical pragmatic by knowing what forms of language deficits occur in his mental lexicon. Besides psychosocial therapy is given, with this therapy the patient is intended to be able to re-adapt to the social environment and be able to take care of himself, be able to be independent not dependent on others so that it does not become a burden on the family.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on research data findings on speech act from patient/person that suffers from pragmatic disorder, it can be categorized into five forms, they are; a) two forms of assertive, b) three forms of directive c) one form of expressive, d) one form of commissive, e) one form of declarative. It can be concluded that all speech act categories are found based on Searle but it has a different number of frequencies, and the dominant appear is directive sentences with three forms and other forms have two and one forms of speech act category. This study only examined speech acts as limited to the gender of men who only knew what speech act categories tended to emerge based on Searle. It is recommended that subsequent researchers might study the gender of women and all ages, for example, children, adolescents, adults, and parents. So that it can be seen variations in the type of speech acts of schizophrenia sufferers.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Airenti, G. (2017). Pragmatic development. *Springer*, 11(23), 3-28.
- Bosco, F.M., Parola, A., Sacco, K., Zettin, M., & Angeleri, R. (2017). Communicative-pragmatic disorders in traumatic brain injury: The role of theory of mind and executive functions. *Brain and Language*, 168, 73-83.
- Brasdefer, J. C. F. (2019). Speech acts in interaction. *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and Pragmatics*, 14-27.
- Blake, M. L. (2017). Right-hemisphere pragmatic disorders. *Research in Clinical Pragmatics*, 11, 243-266.
- Bosco, F. M., & Parola, A. (2017). Schizophrenia. *Research in Clinical Pragmatics*, 11, 267-290.
- Bosco, F.M., Berardineli, L., & Parola, A. (2019). The ability of patients with schizophrenia to comprehend and produce sincere, deceitful, and ironic communicative intentions: the role of theory of mind and executive functions. *Journal Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1-13.
- Burkhard, A. (1990). Speech acts, meaning and intentions: Critical Approaches to the Philosophy. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Cummings, L. (2009). *Clinical pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cummings, L. (2016). Reportech speech: a clinical pragmatic perspective. *Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy & Psychology*, 5, 31-54.
- Carrol, B. A. (2019). Assessing L2 pragmatics: issues and considerations. *Columbia University*, 19(4), 35-41.
- Coman, D. C., & Mian, N. D. (2019). Language disorder. *Current Clinical Psychiatry*, 79-102.
- Davidson, G. C., Neale, J. M., & Kring, A. M. (2012). *Psikologi abnormal* (Ed. 9, Cet.3). Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Fogal, D., Harris, D.W., & Moss, M. (Eds.). (2018). *New work on speech acts*. Oxford University Press.
- Gabbatore, I., Bosco, F. M., Makinen, L., Ebeling, H., Hurtig, T., & Loukusa, S. (2019). Investigating pragmatic abilities in young Finnish adults using the assessment battery for communication. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 16(1), 27-56.
- Gillam, R.B., & Marquardt, T.P. (2019). *Communication sciences and disorders: From science to clinical practice*. Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Grewendorf, G., & Meggle, G. (2002). *Speech acts, mind, and social reality: discussions with John R Searle*. Berlin: Springer.
- Ilie, C., & Neal R. N. (2018). *Pragmatics and its interfaces*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jagoe, C. (2017). Disruption of pragmatics in adulthood. *Research in Clinical Pragmatics*, 11, 181-210.
- Jucker, A.H., Schneider, K.P., & Bublitz, W. (Eds.). (2018). *Methods in pragmatics*, 10. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Massaro, D. W. (2001). Speech perception', in N. M. Smelser and P. B. Baltes (Eds.). International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Mitchell, R. L. C., & Crow, T. J. (2005). Right hemisphere language functions and schizophrenia: the forgotten hemisphere. *Brain*, 128(5), 963-78.
- Malmkjær, K. (2006). *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge.
- Montemurro, S., Mondini, S., Signorini, M., Marchetto, A., Bambini, V., & Arcara, G. 2019). Pragmatic language disorder in parkinson's disease and the potential effect of cognitive reserve. *Journal Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1-18.
- Ninio, A., & Catherine E. S. (2018). *Pragmatic development*. New York: Routledge.
- Petry, S. (2018). Cognitive abilities and theory of mind in explaining communicative-pragmatic disorders in patients with schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Research*, 260, 144-151.
- Reginsson, G.W., Ingason, A., Euesden, J., Bjornsdottir, G., Olafsson, S., Sigurdsson, E., ... & Steinberg, S. (2018). Polygenic scores for schizophrenia and bipolar disorder associate with addiction. *Addiction biology*, 23(1), 485-492.
- Riglin, L., Collishaw, S., Richards, A., Thapar, A.K., Rice, F., Maughan, B., ... & Thapar, A. (2018). The impact of schizophrenia and mood disorder risk alleles on emotional problems: investigating change from childhood to middle age. *Psychological Medicine*, 1-6.
- Sbisa, M. (2009). Uptake and converntionaly in illocution varietiers of speech act norms. *Lodz Paper in Pragmatics*, 5(1), 33-52.
- Sbisa, M. (2018). Varieties of speech act norms. *Brill*, 112, 23-50.
- Searle, J.R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). *Speech act theory and pragmatics*. Holland: D. Reidel.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1999). *Expression and meaning: studies in the theory of speech acts*. New York:Cambridge.
- Suryani, Y. (2015). Defisit pragmatik tuturan penderita skizofrenia di rumah sakit jiwa menur Surabaya; Kajian Pragmatik Klinis. *Jurnal Pena Indonesia*, 1(2), 101-144.
- Salette, M., Goffman, L., Ward, C., & Oleson, J. (2018). Influence of language load on speech motor skill in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, 61(3), 675.
- SNOW, P., & DOUGLAS, J. (2017). PSYCHOSOCIAL ASPECTS OF PRAGMATIC DISORDERS. *RESEARCH IN CLINICAL PRAGMATICS*, 11, 617-640.
- Swineford, L.B., Thurm, A., Baird, G., Wetherby, A.M., & Swedo, S..(2014). Social (pragmatic) communication disorder: a research review of this new DSM-5 diagnostic category. *Journal of Neurodevelopmental Disorders*, 6(1), 41.

- Taylor, L. J., & Whitehouse, A. J. O. (2016). Autism spectrum disorder, language disorder, and social (pragmatic) communication disorder: overlaps, distinguishing features, and clinical implications. *Australian Psychologist*, 51(4), 287–295.
- Tulgar, A. T. (2018). A qualitative investigation of pragmatic development in foreign and target context. *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal*, (1)7, 158-192.
- Taguchi, N. (2018). Advanced second language pragmatic competence. *The Handbook of Advanced Proficiency in Second Language Acquisition*, 505–526.
- Toki, E.I., Fakitsa, P., Drosos, K., Pange, J., Siafaka, V., Karampas, A., & Petrikis, P. (2018). Pragmatics communication deficiencies and the role of gamification. *The European Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences EJSBS*, 22, 2624-2637.
- Weiser, M. (2019). Understanding the association between advanced paternal age and schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. *Psychological Medicine*, 1–7.