

A Political Linguistic Investigation of Illocutionary Forces in Theresa May's Speech on *Brexit*

¹Triana Mey Linda, ²Fajar Susanto

Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya

*Corresponding Author

Email: fajarsusanto@unipasby.ac.id

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to investigate the illocutionary force uttered by Theresa May which focuses on political aspects in the context of Brexit and how the illocutionary force is responded by people. In conducting this research, qualitative research was used to describe two kinds of data: utterances containing illocutionary force in Theresa May's speech on Brexit and responses to those illocutionary forces. The results of the research based on Theresa May's speech on political aspects of Brexit are emphasized on the international relationship, law and regulation, geographical border, and government. The responses based on the illocutionary forces uttered by Theresa May in her speech on Brexit were to persuade British people that Brexit was right to do. Aside from that, it was used to relieve British's fear towards Brexit. Those illocutionary forces were well inferred by the responders because the writer found the relevance between the illocutionary forces and its responses.

Keywords: *illocutionary force, political aspects, implied meaning, Brexit*

INTRODUCTION

The illocutionary force becomes fashionable discussion in the language use since it represents the speakers' intentions regarding to what they intend to perform by means of making the utterances, for instance the acts of stating, requesting, inviting, asking and so on. When uttering their intention, the speakers convey the illocutionary force in different ways, either direct or indirect speech act. When the illocutionary force is delivered explicitly or directly, the intention of the speakers can be understood by the hearers literally. However, when the intention of the speakers is delivered implicitly or indirectly, it has the meaning beyond the sentence (*see* Yule, 1996; Brown & Yule, 1983). Therefore, the hearers need contexts of utterances in order that the intended meaning of the speakers can be inferred accurately, as the speakers intend. Beside the context, the background knowledge is also necessary for the hearers to infer the illocutionary force of the speakers' utterances comprehensively. In addition, Brown and Yule (1983) in Cutting (2002: 2) state:

The speaker's meaning is dependent on assumptions of knowledge that are shared by both speakers and hearer. The speakers construct the linguistic message and intends or implies a meaning and the hearer interprets the message and infers the meaning.

Based on the statement above, it triggers to the analysis of the illocutionary force based on the speech of the British Prime Minister Theresa May on *Brexit*. *Brexit* was a big issue and it also influences the economy in Europe and the world, that's why it is an interesting issue to be analyzed to make people understand and

be aware of *Brexit*.

In relation to illocutionary forces uttered by British Prime Minister, Theresa May in her official speech, it is not simply emotional utterance to deliver, but also rhetorical way to convey. Thus, May's speech is assumed full of implied meanings. That's why the utterances from her speech must be connected with the context and shared knowledge, in order that the listeners can infer what the Prime Minister means. The Illocutionary forces of Theresa May's utterances are related to impulsive meaning which can be traced as political factor to convince people's awareness of the importance of *Brexit*. In other words, it is used to make people understand, believe, and probably influence the British People to do something.

In addition, the investigation is also related to how people responded to Theresa May' official speech on Brexit. The speech on *Brexit* has been being controversial and it gained many responses from the people in every walk of life. Therefore, it is necessary to analyze how people respond to British Prime Minister's speech on a big decision of British to exit from European Union. From the speech, there are many things that must be uncover where the speech is going to go.

Speech Acts and Communication

Speech act is a term used by Austin referring to the act of language and consisting locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Generally speaking, speech act is the use of language that has performative function in language. Any speech act mostly reflects and refers to the performance of several acts at once, but they are distinguished by dissimilar aspects of the speaker's purpose. There is the act of saying something which is followed up by what one is doing in saying it, for example, requesting, promising, persuading someone else. Thus, speech acts are usually related to some acts like promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting and congratulating.

Furthermore, according to Austin (1962), speech act is the actions performed in saying something (Cutting, 2002). According to Austin as quoted by Jacob L. Mey (1993: 110). It implies that when the speaker utters words, it can bring some actions. What someone says can give the impact of what someone else does. Just take a look at a very simple idea when one gives promise, the other would wait for it. The way the other waits is actually the effect of the speech act. Of course, in uttering it, one can say it either explicitly or implicitly. Therefore, based on the speech act theory proposed by Austin, action performed when utterance is produced can be analysed on three levels (Cutting, 2002). Those three levels of speech act are: Locutionary Act, Illocutionary Act, and Perlocutionary Effect.

Locutionary act is the act of saying thing. Whatever the speakers want to convey their intention, they have to utter something. In other words, what is said is the form of words uttered by the speaker as a sign. Illocutionary force is what is meant in proposition content of locution. It is about the speaker's intended meaning or the specific purposes that speaker has in mind. In the other words, when the speakers utter a sentence, there is another meaning lying under it. The possible meanings that lay in the utterance has function such as request, warning, suggest, promise ask, question, and etc. The last level of the speech act is Perlocutionary effect. A perlocutionary effect is the hearer's reaction to the speaker's utterance. In other words, it is the effect when the speaker utters something. The effect for saying something will influence the speakers, and also the hearer. For example, when the

speaker questions the hearer, it will make the hearer do something that is answer that question (*see* Finch, 2002:1). With that understanding, this can be said that speech act theory is dedicated to striking the balance between convention and intention (*see* Sadock, 1974:460).

Furthermore, speech acts are not only in sole communication, they also appear in global units of communication such as conversations or discourses (*see* Vanderveken, 1994:53). Speakers perform their speech acts in the whole conversations where they are in verbal interaction with the others. The others reply to and perform in return with the same collective intention to get into the context. Therefore, the use of language is a social form of linguistic performance. It consists of well-organized sequences of utterances constructed by some speakers to achieve discursive purposes, such as discussing a question, reacting to a certain situation, or negotiating the possibility. This is the essence of conversation under the circumstance of convenience (Wierzbicka, 1987:2).

Context of Speech and Contextual Meaning

Nunan (1993) stated that there are two kinds of contexts in the use of language namely linguistic and non-linguistic contexts. Linguistic contexts deal with language in the environment setting where the discourse is analyzed, whilst non-linguistics contexts consist of communication types, purposes, topics, settings, participants, and shared background knowledge of a certain event. The role of non-linguistics contexts is to give limitation the discourse and to help how the problems of research can be described comprehensively. For example, the form of speech delivered by British Prime Minister Theresa May on Brexit can influence how communication is conveyed. The type of communication also gives a certain role to convey the intention, such as a monologue used by Theresa May in her speech on Brexit. Besides that, the topic of a speech delivered by Theresa May also influences towards Britain exit from European Union (EU). The purpose of this speech is to convince British people to exit from EU. The next element on non-linguistics context is setting, participants, and shared background knowledge.

The setting where this speech declared was on 17 January 2017 in London. The participants are all citizens of Britain, Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland who will decide whether the United Kingdom must leave the European Union or remain in the European Union by doing vote. And the shared background knowledge between the speaker and the participants (hearer) is related to the political economy which is initiated of several reasons why Theresa May as the British Prime Minister insists to do *Brexit*. Here are the several reasons why British wants a divorce from the organization (EU). First, those who want *Brexit* to happen believe that EU power is too much and it has an impact on British sovereignty. In simple world, EU limits the British moves, both in economy and politics. Second, the Brexiters (people who are pro-*Brexit*) are disturbed by the rules set in Brussels, the EU headquarters, where they believe it prevents businesses from operating efficiently. Of course, it is economy factor because in fact, Pound sterling is controlled by Euro. Third, the issue of migrants that triggers the *Brexit* debate to heat-up. It can be seen as political elitism (*see* Friedman, 2016).

In fact, there are about 3 million EU citizens living in the UK, while there are about 1.2 million British people scattered in a number of EU countries. It has no surprise to see that migrants for a number of issues such as unemployment, low

wages, and damage to the education system and health and even traffic congestion. Furthermore, Britain is one of America's main partners in trade, so this monumental change can create uncertainty in the future of the relationship, especially if the United Kingdom experiences a collapse or a depression. The IMF (International Monetary Fund) warned that *Brexit* could reduce the economic output of many countries, especially EU countries (see Smith, 2018). As a result, the value of the euro or pound would fall below the dollar. This would be a strong blow for US exporters. Meanwhile, outside of economic relations, United States also deserves to worry about the post-*Brexit* political instability.

With those factors, it can be understood why Theresa May as the Prime Minister spoke buoyantly about the important of Brexit. Besides, in *The Independent*, Rebecca Glover, from the Policy Innovation Research Unit, sees May as *conservative, anti-immigration and isolationist* (Glover, 2016). Conservative refers to self-defensive and strict, anti-immigration refers to nationalism, and isolationist refers to self-independency. Those characters can accumulate a simple image of May who wants *Brexit* to happen because she implies to make British self-independent in economy, nationality, and prosperity.

Political Language and Its Implied Meaning

Language can be used in different fields such as in politic domain, economic domain, education domain or other things. Joseph (2006) states that language reflects the speaker's intelligence, industry, and social worthiness level of exposure or education. The language domain in communication is influenced by topics and also the purposes of communication, for example in the context of politics.

In politics, language gives some roles to persuade and influence people. The power and responsibility of the speakers can be reflected from the linguistic-political dimension that utilizes languages to achieve their goals. In relation to politics, Thomas (2004) states that politics deals with power including the power of making decisions, controlling resources, controlling other people's behavior and often controlling their values.

Politics and power cannot be separated. The power and political beliefs enforcement can be gained using some strategies, namely through physical coercion or legal system. The physical coercion events that are regarded as significant in history involve in the imposition, military rules, dictatorial regimes, and the like. Some types of coercions are also implemented in a democracy through the legal system e.g. there are laws which regulate where people are supposed to litter, laws on the prohibition of destroying others belongings, and the laws that rule where and when people can drink alcohol legally.

Talking about politics can be so difficult for some people. However, politics can be seen simply as a study that is related to anything to do with the State. This is the problem, to do can be associated to rule the State and it implies some practices to handle or at least to convince the whole people to be united in the State. Therefore, politics refers to a battle to enforce the legitimate principle of vision and division. Anyone who is dominant can have this power or at least, anyone who can operate symbolical violence can be recognized as deserving to dominate (Bourdieu, 2005: 39).

The meaning of symbolical violence refers to controlling or mastering the use of language. In convincing people to choose him or her as the leader, there must

be oration or speech which is practiced in rhetorical delivering. Of course, to convince people, there must be challenge from the other candidate who also plays the same game. Therefore, politics can be seen as a struggle for power, between people who search for assertion of their power and people who try to resist it. It is also seen as cooperation, “as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty, and the like” (Chilton, 2004: 3). This is the art of convincing people about the idea and language plays important role in it.

To play the game of convincing people, there is a term proposed by Burkhardt, *Political linguistics*. Burkhardt as quoted by Wodak (2009) sees that political linguistics is an attempt to mix scientific research dealing with the analysis of political discourse into an academic discipline (Wodak, 2009: 6). Burkhardt also suggests the use of *political language* as the basic term that contains all kinds of public, institutional (party), and private discussions on political issues. The used language including the lexical and stylistic linguistic instruments, must refer to political contexts. Furthermore, Burkhardt also lists some procedures which are related to political language: (1) lexical-semantic techniques (analysis of catchwords and value words, of euphemisms, and of ideological polysemy); (2) sentence and text-semantic procedures (for example, analysis of tropes, of semantic isotopes, and of inclusion and exclusion strategies); (3) pragmatic and text-linguistic techniques (for example, analysis of forms of address, speech acts, allusions, presuppositions, conversation, argumentation, rhetoric, quotations, genres, and intertextuality); and (4) Semiotic techniques (for example, analysis of icon, symbol, and semiotic analysis). In this context, this research has its relevance to use it in the scope of pragmatics, because this research analyzes the speech from its illocutionary forces, in which, it is speech acts.

With that simple understanding, it can be assumed that studying the language of politicians always implies taking the context into account, how the politicians’ work to convince people, how to get into the contextual information, or how to understand the discursive behavior of politicians (Wodak, 2009: 7).

In the simple summary, it can be related that this main focus of this research is to investigate the implied meaning (illocutionary forces) of Theresa May’s speech on *Brexit*. As it is known, *Brexit* is a huge issue that can affects the political relation of British toward Uni-European countries, including United States. Therefore, the language that is used by May in her political speech is so tightly important to analyze, especially to her implied meaning that seems to push British to exit from Uni-Europe.

METHOD

The study was designed by using qualitative approach. The source of the data is Theresa May’s Brexit Speech about *12 Objectives for Negotiations*. It is conveyed on Tuesday, 17 January 2017, 13:55 pm as the source of the primary data. The transcript of this speech is taken from the popular newspaper, *The Independent* via online. It is retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk>. And the secondary data of this research is taken from online sources also from the official newspaper such as BBC, Business Insider, The Conversation and so forth. The data were collected by way of searching, watching, fragmenting, and coding data. The data collection began with a comprehensive reading of Theresa May’s Brexit Speech.

Then, the researcher searched the secondary data; the people's responses related to the illocutionary force as primary data which had been collected before to show that the illocutionary forces were well-inferred by the responders as what Theresa May meant. The analysis of the data used discourse analysis by finding the implied meaning of Theresa May's utterances regarded to the political aspects of Brexit by doing some steps according to Watson-Gegeo (1997) as quoted by Mackay & Gass (2005) divided cyclical data analysis into several steps: initiating situation, displaying data, analyzing content, and concluding.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results and discussion of this research focus on political aspects and emphasize on four things: international relationship, law and regulation, geographical border, and government as well as the people's responses towards the illocutionary forces of Theresa May's Brexit Speech.

International relationship

International relation is a part of political science, therefore the component of international relations itself cannot be separated from international politics, international organizations, administration, and international law. It also includes various kinds of interactions or relationships that cross national boundaries and that involve several actors of different nationalities. In international relation, the actors (State, government, leader, diplomat, community) always aim at certain purposes (goals, objectives, expectations) by using means (such as diplomacy, coercion and persuasion) that are associated with power or its capabilities (Linklater, 1996).

With that simple understanding, it can be assumed that establishing international relationship with other states is very important for Britain because it basically leads to rewards not just for Britain but also for all states which involve in it, not necessarily equal rewards, but everyone should benefit from it. However, practically, international relationship is likely to have conflict between the main actors of the international system, in other word, essentially conflict is inevitable (Clackson, 2011).

There are a lot of evidences to support that, it also appeared in the Brexit case. Britain considers joining EU is likely to get harm because Britain should pay EU budget which is quite higher than other countries in EU, Britain also be country which receives the freest movement of people, EU people not only come to work but also to settle in UK which occurring the lacks of public services, law wages, and unemployment that increase a number of crimes. That's why Britain decides to leave EU. Britain exits from EU is not kind of threat for EU only but also Britain itself. Brexit causes the chaos of borders, the higher price of foods, disrupt flight, and also disaster of business. There are a lot of things to do to prepare the upcoming uncertain time. Britain needs to get ready for whatever happens during the final deal of Brexit. No one knows the final deal between EU and Britain whether "Soft Brexit" "Hard Brexit" or "No Deal". "Soft Brexit" means keep close ties UK relationship with EU by staying in single market and custom union, but crucially UK continuing to pay EU budget and accepting the free movement of people.

"Hard Brexit" means Britain exits from EU by giving up full access of single market and custom union, only few existing ties of UK and EU are kept, it is likely to stop paying EU budget. The UK is free to choose its own regulations and to

negotiate new trade deals with other countries around the world. The UK is still be able to work and trade with EU but it's difficult, stricter, and it causes friction. Also, UK has to follow the set of rules to work, freedom of movement would end, but UK citizens will also lose the automatic right to live and work in EU. And "No Deal" means UK will trade with the EU under the rule of WTO (World Trade Organization), it is a global party which governs international trade.

When the UK trades with EU under the WTO rules, the UK needs to pay tax on import and export from another country called tariff. But tariffs remain a feature of trading under WTO rules and the EU charges a range of tariffs depending on the product or service. For example, the tariff on food products and beverages imported into the EU is 21% of the value of a shipment. The UK's fishing exports to the EU would be subject to a 9.6% tariff under WTO rules. Clothes manufactured in the UK and exported to the EU would be subject to an 11% tariff. It means "No Deal" for Britain would be bad for British business and the wider economy (Jackson & Shepotylo, 2018).

Therefore, Britain's negotiator is passionate to seek a deal with EU concerning the final deal of Brexit. To anticipate that kind of obscurity, Britain strengthens its relationship with Commonwealth, it is also a form of UK's cooperation out of Europe. It is an international association consisting of the UK together with states that were previously part of the British Empire, and dependencies. That's why in her speech, she touched on the issue of establishing the international relation with other countries, not only in Europe, but also outside Europe. It can be proved by this fragmentation.

Data extract 1

Instinctively, we want to travel to, study in, trade with countries not just in Europe but beyond the borders of our continent. Even now as we prepare to leave the EU, we are planning for the next biennial Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in 2018 – a reminder of our unique and proud global relationships.

Illocutionary Force of this utterances is that Theresa May infers that she already has a plan for the upcoming time right after Brexit. She has a straight purpose to build better Britain by promoting cooperation with Commonwealth. It is a various community of 53 nations such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Malaysia, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, countries in Africa, and so forth that cooperate together to promote democracy, prosperity, and peace.

The Commonwealth is one of the world's oldest political association of states. Its roots go back to the British Empire when some countries were ruled directly or indirectly by Britain. Some of these countries became self-governing while retaining Britain's monarch as Head of State. They formed the British Commonwealth of Nations (BBC, 2012).

The British monarch is the symbolic head of the Commonwealth, but politically these counties are independent. By saying those utterances she also wants to enlighten everybody that she and her parliament has already set the plan towards a common future Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting on 16th-20th April 2018. In that meeting, UK accommodated the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) where leaders from all the member countries gathered in London and Windsor. The leaders came together to advocate the

common values, address the shared global challenges faced by each country and agree how to work to create a better future for all citizens, particularly young people. In line with this, the utterances from Theresa May gains the response from Sir Vince Cable, the leader of the Liberal Democrats.

Data extract 2

The Commonwealth is an important institution, but the Brexiters are wrong to see this as an alternative to the EU. They want to embark on Empire 2.0, which is wrong and resented across the Commonwealth. (Payne, 2018)

In his point of view, he thinks that leaving EU is not a good idea for Britain's future because it will make Britain suffer because EU is the UK's largest trading partner. In 2017, UK exports to the EU were £274 billion (44% of all UK exports). UK imports from the EU were £341 billion (53% of all UK imports) (*see* Ward, 2018). It has no surprise that Cable said the Commonwealth is not an alternative of EU. In addition, most of countries want to build a relationship with the United Kingdom in terms of trade are also due to United Kingdom join the single market of European Union. It is also being proved by Cable when he also quoted the speech by Abe, the Japanese ambassador, claiming: "his warm words should not mislead us into believing in a prosperous life after Brexit." He also added "As the Japanese ambassador himself has made clear, the best way to ensure Japanese companies continue to create jobs and invest in the UK is to remain in the Single Market and Customs Union" (*See* Payne, 2018).

From Cable's point of view, the commonwealth is totally different with the single market controlled by EU. Joining EU the sale of British goods to European Union countries is very easy, as well as the flow of immigrants in large numbers, most of whom are young people who want to work in the UK can be a strong foundation in economic growth as an important factor for the UK to remain in the European Union. In addition, the status of Britain in the eyes of the world is considered safer with 28 other members of the country than if walking alone is an important factor for the UK to survive. The influence of Brexit on the economy is very large. Where if the UK continues to join the European Union, business turnover becomes easier. The transfer of money, immigrants and production from Britain to European countries is not a problem and is not complicated (Madjid, 2017).

Geographical Area

In relation with illocutionary forces uttered by British Prime Minister, Theresa May in her official speech, she also points out about geographical area with Republic Ireland. The utterance is provided below

Data extract 3

And the family ties and bonds of affection that unite our two countries mean that there will always be a special relationship between us. So we will work to deliver a practical solution that allows the maintenance of the Common Travel Area with the Republic, while protecting the integrity of the United Kingdom's immigration system. Nobody wants to return to the borders of the past, so we will make it a priority to deliver a practical solution as soon as we can.

The illocutionary of the utterances above, Theresa May refers to seek a practical solution to maintain the Common Travel Area with the Republic of Ireland because as we know that Common Travel Area is an arrangement that permits ease of travel and other benefits such as residency for immigrants, between the United Kingdom, Ireland, the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. It's applied since 1922 when the Irish Free State chose to operate the same travel restrictions as the UK. The Common Travel Area is based on a collection of legal provisions rather than an international treaty or concrete agreement. There is no single legal agreement establishing its arrangements. It came in 1921 The Anglo-Irish Treaty, which established the independence of the Irish Free State from England, does not contain arrangements for cross-border travel. The United Kingdom and the Free State of Ireland agreed to an administrative understanding in 1922 that maintained the free movement of people (*see Carswell, 2018*).

Even England and the Republic of Ireland already formed to share a land border right before they registered as the member of EU, but to continue the common travel area operation after Brexit, England and Republic of Ireland still need permission from the EU since the Republic of Ireland and Britain has been registered in EU since 1973. Automatically, EU still have the role to take a part in this case.

In relation with Common Travel Area, in 1985, the EU made a Schengen agreement (Schengen Approval). The Schengen Agreement is the abolition of supervision EU member borders and free movement agreement humans on a Schengen visa. Then Britain and Ireland rejected this agreement because England considers by applying Schengen it will damage England. The reasons rejecting this agreement is that Britain is afraid of losing potential control immigration, the UK must accept migrants from other member of EU countries, not just visiting but looking for work. This is feared by the UK because it will make it difficult for British citizens to get job and has an effect on rising unemployment and crime. So, UK and Republic of Ireland keep applying the Common Travel Area, it is a visa which is similar to Schengen but only applied in England, Ireland and including Isle of Man islands and Channel Islands.

In summary, historically, Theresa May implies to maintain the Common Travel Area with the Republic Ireland for many years by choosing the best practical solution because Common Travel Area is really efficient for Britain to control the number of immigrants who come to Britain, and it also protects the integrity of the United Kingdom's immigration system.

That illocutionary force then gaining the response as reported from European Movement from Taoiseach, Leo Varadkar has stated recently that he is confident the CTA will be maintained post-Brexit:

Data extract 4

Nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. However, I am confident that, no matter what happens, the Common Travel Area will remain in place . . . The European Union has taken the view that we can continue that (*European Movement, 2018*)

It's clear that the common travel area between England and Republic of Ireland agreed each other about the operation of Common Travel Area even UK

leaves EU. The Common Travel Area was established in the 1920s, the Common Travel Area allows British and Irish citizens to move freely and live in one another's countries. Although it is recognized in EU treaty contract, it is based on domestic legislation in Britain and Ireland which offer one another's citizens greater rights than immigrants from elsewhere because it was established between these two countries away before Britain and Ireland registered in EU. In short, Irish citizens can continue to enjoy the reciprocal rights associated with the CTA in the same way that British citizens in Ireland would if there is no deal of Brexit. These rights include the right to work, study and vote, access to social welfare benefits and health services. Where required domestic legislation and agreements would be updated to ensure that the CTA rights continue to have a clear legal basis. But these two still need to ask for an agreement from EU to make it clear (Staunton, 2018).

Law and Regulation

The third part of political aspect is about law and regulation. Behind the benefits that Britain gained from the EU, Britain also received the consequences which harm the UK from EU rules, there are four problems which trigger British to do Brexit because of run the rules set by EU. First, Britain must pay the retribution to the EU. The retribution which is paid by Britain quite large compared to other EU member countries, in 2015, the UK paid € 18.2 billion. This is why UK left EU. British Government believes that the funds can be used for building industry in the UK. Second, Britain must implement the European monetary system, where more advanced countries must help the underdeveloped countries in the EU to be more equitable. This could hamper the UK to increase its economic pace with the potential of the British economy is quite large. The third is the national sovereignty of England which is reduced because of EU intervention against its member countries through rules made by EU in which member countries must involve the EU and cannot determine its policy and determine its own partners by themselves. Then the fourth is immigration issues, the UK must accept immigrants from member countries of EU. The entry of these immigrants certainly has an impact on the limited job vacancies especially for British society itself. This is the crucial problem which became the core of Britain to leave EU. Also, the problem that British society sees from being a member of the European Union is that the intervention is too far away from the sovereignty of a country. The influence of the business provided by the European Union on Britain was largely an influence that brought harm to the British and resulted in a sense of disappointment in British society (BBC, 2017).

With that simple understanding, Theresa May's speech on Brexit purposes to address EU to take more attention on the sovereignty of Britain if it continuing the rules set by EU, Britain cannot protect their own workers' rights. It is shown by this following fragmentation

Data extract 5

And a fairer Britain is a country that protects and enhances the rights people have at work. That is why, as we translate the body of European law into our domestic regulations, we will ensure that workers' rights are fully protected and maintained.

The illocutionary of those utterances, Theresa May spoke to European Union and European people by doing Brexit, Britain can create the fairer Britain in terms of protecting the worker's right by exiting the EU, it is easy for Britain to regulate their own law and regulations. Britain wants to maintain its own sovereignty. The intended sovereignty will be better and more profitable if a country rules its own country without intervention of others, Britain can make, implement, and apply the law, and charge its own tax rate because since 2010 the European Union has introduced 3,500 new laws that affect UK business (Business Insider, 2015). By doing Brexit, Britain doesn't need to run the EU rules in its country and doesn't need to receive the large number of immigrants who come to Britain to seek for a job. Britain can be the one who organizes its own regulations, especially in terms of the citizens' right on job, she is confident that Britain will create a lot of jobs for British people and they no longer have to scramble a chance in terms of work with immigrants originating from member States of the EU. This is the point why Theresa May said by no longer join the EU it will be creating United Kingdom better and fairer.

By the time, these utterances also receive response from the Rt Hon Stephen Dorrell, Chair of the European Movement as reported also in European Movement in 2017, said:

Data extract 6

There is a gaping hole at the heart of the Prime Minister's speech today. She was at pains to explain the "hard fact" that it is in Britain's interests to align our regulations and practices with the EU in a wide range of activities and to maintain a close political relationship with our friends in the rest of Europe. What she failed to do was set out any rationale for divergence. What is the problem to which Brexit is the solution? Why will Britain be better off if we do accept all the "hard facts" she says are unavoidable? She says we must accept the "hard fact" that we shall have less access to continental markets than we have now. We must accept the "hard fact" of a border in Ireland. We must accept the "hard fact" that we shall have to continue to pay into the EU budget. We must accept the "hard fact" that European law will continue to apply to many areas of national life. The costs are clear. What is the benefit? The Prime Minister famously refused to say she would support Brexit if there were another referendum. We are being led to a destination which the Prime Minister did not endorse, and for which she has completely failed to make a case. That is why the final deal must be put to the people. Only they have the right to gamble our country's future in such a reckless way (*European Movement, 2017*)

From that response, it can be concluded that Stephen Dorrell sees too many difficult facts for Britain to exit from the EU, such as Britain needs to accept a limited access to a single market, pay EU contributions, accept that European law would still be applied in many aspects of life in Britain, must accept difficult facts about boundaries with the Republic of Ireland and so forth. In Dorrell's perspective, he doesn't find any advantage for Britain by leaving the EU. And he also claimed that only the people who can decide the final deal to stake the country's future in a careless way.

Government

United Kingdom consists of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Its government is in the form of a Monarchy and a decentralized state system. The British state adheres to a parliamentary system of government in which government power is in the prime minister and minister (can also be called a cabinet). While the power of head of state is in the hands of the Queen. Like the theory of a parliamentary system of government, the Queen does not have political power because the Queen only acts as a symbol of state sovereignty and unity. Britain Legislative power is in the hands of parliament or commonly called the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

With that simple understanding, it can be assumed that Theresa May is the only one who has strong power to lead Britain exit from the EU and also set out the regulations in the government. So, it has no surprise if Theresa May as the Prime Minister spoke about the benefit of leaving EU because it gives Britain Government freedom to make, implement, and apply the law its regulations including workers' rights protection. It can be proved by this fragmentation

Data extract 7

Indeed, under my leadership, not only will the Government protect the rights of workers' set out in European legislation, we will build on them. Because under this Conservative Government, we will make sure legal protection for workers keeps pace with the changing labor market – and that the voices of workers are heard by the boards of publicly-listed companies for the first time.

The illocutionary force of this utterance is that Theresa May wants to convey that under his leadership, the rights of the workers not only be protected as specified in European legislation, but the rights of the workers also be more prosperous. As Theresa conveyed in her speech, it has meaning beyond the words that by leaving EU the UK would be free from all rules set by the European Union. By expanding the links in terms of trade with country around the world, Theresa May is sure that the field of work will be wider and the indigenous population of the UK will not feel the limitation of the jobs available because they have to compete with immigrants from countries that are members of the European Union and they can enter and settle in the UK easily as The UK are still the member of EU. The government will introduce legislation to strengthen workers' rights, including scrapping the loophole known as the Swedish derogation which allows companies to pay agency workers less than full-time staff. (See Burt, 2018).

Then this Illocutionary force gaining the response from the Greg Clark, the business secretary of the UK as reported in by Gavin Jackson in London December 17, 2018

Data extract 8

Today's largest upgrade in workers' rights in over a generation is a key part of building a labor market that continues to reward people for hard work, that celebrates good employers and is boosting productivity and earning potential across the UK," (Jackson, *The Conversation*, 2018)

From that response, it can be concluded that Greg agrees with the decision made by Theresa May as Britain Prime Minister, she makes the better labor market by enhancing and always appreciating the workers' hard work. It also can make

higher productivity and create good potential entirely for Britain in term of labor market. The workers feel appreciated and it keeps them doing their best for the country.

CONCLUSION

This study has indicated that the purpose of communication does not need to be conveyed literally by saying what is intended. Theresa May's speech on Brexit has shown how the illocutionary forces or intended meanings are conveyed indirectly. Therefore, intended meanings or illocutionary forces must be interpreted by the hearers based on the contexts of communication where the communication occurs. Illocutionary force in Theresa May's speech on Brexit has affected and persuaded hearers to go with her in doing Brexit. Based on the interpretation of illocutionary force, there are four aspects emphasized in the context of Brexit: international relationship, law and regulation, geographical area, and government. Intended meaning can be interpreted well based on the context and also the background knowledge possessed the hearers in understanding utterances. The people of the UK respond to what is said and what is intended and react to the purpose of communication conveyed by Theresia May in terms of Brexit.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BBC News. 2012. "Profile: The Commonwealth", *BBC*, retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1554175.stm
- BBC News. 2017. "Inggris keluar dari UE, David Cameron mundur dari kursi PM", *BBC*, retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/indonesia/dunia/2016/06/160624_dunia_inggris_cam_eron
- Bourdieu, P. 2005. "The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and the Journalistic Field", in R. Benson and E. Neveu (eds.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brown, J. D. 2003. *Research methods for applied linguistics*. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burt, E. 2018. "Repeal of Swedish derogation 'could lead to huge change for recruitment businesses'", *People Management*. Retrieved from <https://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/news/articles/repeal-derogation-could-lead-change-recruitment-businesses>
- Buzan, B., Waever, O., & Wilde, J. de. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Colorado Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Carswell, Simon. 2018 "What is the Common Travel Area?", *Irishtimes*, retrieved from <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/politics/explainer-what-is-the-common-travel-area-1.3696137>
- Chilton, P. 2004. *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Clackson. 2011. "Conflict and Cooperation in International Relations", *E-IR*, retrieved from <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/02/01/conflict-and-cooperation->

in-international-relations/#_ftn2

- Creswell, J. G. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Emerson, Michael. 2017. "Theresa May's Brexit Speech of 17 January 2017: Decoding its Clarity and Ambiguity," *CEPS Policy Insight*, No. 2017/01, 25 January 2017, retrieved from https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/ME_TMayBrexitSpeech.
- European Movement. 2018. "All EU Need To Know': The Common Travel Area Explained", *European Movement*. Retrieved from <https://www.europeanmovement.ie/all-eu-need-to-know-the-common-travel-area-explained/>
- Friedman, George. 2016. "3 Reasons Brits Voted for Brexit", *Forbes*, retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnmauldin/2016/07/05/3-reasons-brits-voted-for-brexit/#1c68290a1f9d>.
- Glover, Rebecca. 2016. "Don't be Misled by Theresa May – She's No Progressive Conservative", *The Independent*. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/theresa-may-conservative-party-leader-shes-no-progressive-conservative-a7109121.html>.
- Hjelmgaard, Kim & Onyanga-Omara, Jane. 2016. "Explainer: The What, When, and Why of Brexit", *USA Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2016/02/22/explainer-what-when-and-why-brexit/80723334/>.
- Jackson, K, & Oleksandr, S. 2018. "No deal? Seven reasons why a WTO-only Brexit would be bad for Britain", *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/no-deal-seven-reasons-why-a-wto-only-brexit-would-be-bad-for-britain-102009>
- Johnson, D. M. 1992. *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. New York: Longman.
- Linklater, S. B. 1996. *Theories of International Relations*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Mackey, A. & Gass, S. M. 2005. *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Madjid, Wira Prabowo. 2017. "Impact of Brexit on European Union Stability", *Thesis*. Jakarta: Universitas Nasional.
- Mey, J. L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Nugroho, Agung Suryo. 2011. "An Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Sherlock Holmes Movie", *Thesis*. Jakarta: UIN Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Payne, A. 2018. "Brexiters have plan to recreate British empire after Brexit says Cable", *Televisor*. Retrieved from <https://www.televisor.co.uk/global/politics/brexiters-have-plan-to-recreate-british-empire-after-brexit-says-cable/100814>
- Payne, A. 2018. "Brexiters want to recreate the British empire after Brexit, says Vince Cable", *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.sg/brexit-resented-plan-to-recreate-the->

british-empire-commonwealth-vince-cable-2018-10/?r=US&IR=T

- Ramanathan, V, & Atkinson, D. 1999. *Ethnographic Approaches and Methods in L2 Writing Research: A Critical Guide and Review*. Applied Linguistics, 20(1), 44-70.
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 1974. *Toward a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Searle, J. R. 2005. *Expression and Meaning; Studies in The Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Oli. 2018. "IMF Warns These Five EU Countries would be Hit Hard by No Deal Brexit - EU Concerned", *Express*, retrieved from <https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/991508/Brexit-News-IMF-report-Brussels-no-deal-Britain-EU>.
- Staunton, D. 2018. "Irish citizens in Britain to retain rights after Brexit", *Irish Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.irishtimes.com/life-and-style/abroad/irish-citizens-in-britain-to-retain-rights-after-brexit-1.3628151>
- Vanderveken, Daniel. 1994. *Essays in Speech Act Theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ward, M. 2018. "Statistics on UK-EU trade", *Parliament*, retrieved from <https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/CBP-7851>
- Wierzcicka, A. 1987. *English Speech Act Verbs: Semantic Dictionary*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wodak, R. 2009. *The Discourse of Politics in Action Politics as Usual*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University press.