

**COMMISSIVE SPEECH ACT IN THE FIRST DEBATE OF JAKARTA
GOVERNOR ELECTION 2017**

Inten Liestyorini

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum

Jurusan/Fakultas Sastra Inggris/Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Diponegoro

ABSTRACT

This research focuses on analyzing commissive speech acts by using Vanderveken's theory (1990). The study aim at 1) classifying the commissive type conducted in the debate of governor election Jakarta, and 2) explaining the illocutionary forces of it. It is conducted in order to know how the candidates using commissive speech act while giving their speech. The type of research is descriptive qualitative. In analyzing the data, the writer took note and classified the commissive type. The study shows that there are five types of commissive out of seven, they are promise, guarantee, threaten, volunteer, refuse. Each candidate shows different styles of explaining their vision and mission. There are sixteen data, but only several data were explained due to similarity of several types.

Keyword : *utterances, commissive, speech act, illocutionary, illocutionary forces indicating devices*

ABSTRAK

Penulisan skripsi ini berfokus pada analisis tindak tutur komisif dengan menggunakan teori Vanderveken (1990). Tujuannya adalah untuk (1) mengklasifikasi tipe-tipe tindak tutur komisif yang dilakukan oleh setiap pasangan calon pada debat pemilihan gubernur Jakarta, 2) menjelaskan tekanan ilokusinya. Hal ini dilakukan dengan tujuan mengetahui bagaimana setiap kandidat menggunakan tindak tutur komisif dalam memberikan penjelasan dalam debat. Tipe penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Pada analisis data, penulis melakukan teknik catat dan klasifikasi tipe komisif. Ada lima macam tipe tindak tutur komisif yang berhasil di temukan, antara lain promise, guarantee, threat, volunteer, dan refusal. Setiap kandidat memperlihatkan cara yang berbeda dalam menjelaskan visi dan misi mereka. Penulis menemukan enam belas data, namun hanya menjelaskan beberapa data saja dikarenakan kesamaan tipe tindak tutur komisif.

Kata kunci : *ucapan, komisif, tindak tutur, ilokusi, alat penunjuk tekanan ilokusi*

Research Problems

Based on the topic of the study, the writer raises two research problems, which are as follows.

1. What kind of commissive acts were conducted by the three candidates?
2. What are the illocutionary forces of the commissive speech act found in the object?

Purpose of the Study

In doing this thesis, the aims of the study are:

1. to describe the commissive speech act employed by the three candidates,
and
2. to explain illocutionary forces of the speech act expressed by the three candidates.

Research Method

This research uses the descriptive qualitative method. The source of data of this research is the first debate that was aired in CNN Indonesia Channel that was shared on YouTube..

The writer also uses note-taking technique or *catat* method (Sudaryanto, 1993:136), which means that the writer rewrites and makes list of words, phrases, or sentences identified as speech acts then the writer analyzes the illocutionary forces and meaning utterances.

1. Direct Speech Acts

Direct Promise

Direct promise is the mostly type found in the data. Promise refers to a future action. Usually, every candidate in a debate uses this type because they explain their intention explicitly and clearly. Here, the writer presents the analysis of the first data.

(Data 3) AHY: *“Paradigma yang akan kami lakukan adalah Jakarta sebagai system ruang kehidupan yang harus mensejahterakan semua dan juga pembangunan yang inklusif dan partisipatif, yang memberdayakan seluruh warga secara adil.”*

“The paradigm that we will do is Jakarta as a system of life space that should be the welfare of all and also the development of an inclusive and participatory, empowering all citizens fairly.”

(Data 4) AHY: *“Saya akan berdiri yang terdepan bersama seluruh warga Jakarta untuk mengubah wajah ibukota menjadi semakin modern unggul, tetapi tetap menjadi kota yang manusiawi dan juga selalu berjati diri, berkarakter pada Jakarta dan Indonesia yang kita cintai.”*

“I will stand at the forefront together with all citizens of Jakarta to change the image of the capital city to become a modern and increasingly superior, but it remains a city that is humane and also always identifiable, has characteristic of Jakarta and Indonesia which we loved.”

Based on the statement said by the first candidate in fragment 3, it shows that he explained the paradigm that he will work on if he is chosen as governor later. AHY and Sylvi promise to all Jakarta residents' that they will do an inclusive and participatory development. They also promise to make the residents' prosperity better. They promise to the hearer that they will bring an economic improvement. While in another data, they promise to change the image of the capital city become a modern and increasingly superior city. In those utterances, AHY explained his intention by his words explicitly. Promise is a way that he used to

show what he will do in future. The presence of the word 'akan/will' makes the act of promise. The existence of the verb "akan/will" makes explicit illocution, makes it direct speech act. The subject in the fragment 3 is the first person plural (Kami/We), while in fragment 4 is the first person singular because the speaker said "I/Saya". The action refers to the future act, which will be done by AHY and Silvy. The type of sentence of the utterance is declarative, because it makes a statement and ends with a period. In the fragment 3, we can see the speaker reported their paradigm.

By using Yule's classification of speech acts, the kind of speech acts used in both of the utterances above (fragments 3 and 4) are classified into commissive. AHY shows what the first candidate will do in the future. He commits to people that the first candidate will do something to the hearer by promise. The speaker makes the world fit to the words. In order to achieve the purpose by uttering the utterances, the speaker's utterance has to be felicitous. The illocutionary force of the act of promise above will be judged felicitous or infelicitous by using Vanderveken's theory.

1) Illocutionary Point

The point of the utterance is direct commissives, because the first candidate commits to do something in future (promise to the citizens) by saying the utterance.

2) Mode of Achievement

AHY promises to the citizen that he will make Jakarta into a better city by his mission. By uttering the sentences above, he invites all of the residents to participate in the paradigm that first candidate will work on.

3) Propositional Content

The utterance refers to the future act and is committed by the speaker (AHY). It means that AHY obligates to do something for the citizens. The word “will” indicates future action.

4) Preparatory Conditions

A promise must give benefits to the citizens in future if they choose AHY in the election. He knows the condition of Jakarta that still has many problems in development, social equality, and else. His promises are to make Jakarta to better, gives economic improvement, and solve the problems in Jakarta (such as traffic, flood, etc).

5) Sincerity Condition

When uttering the words, AHY seems not really sincere about his words. It looks like he explains his vision and mission too fast and like a recitation.

6) Degree of Strength

The degree of strength of the promise is low. In the explanation of AHY about first candidate’s vision and mission, he could not make the hearer really get what program he will do in the future to make Jakarta clearly.

Briefly, the act of promise is classified into commissive speech act. It is a commitment for the speaker to be responsible toward his future action. The utterances said by the speaker purpose to make the hearer to do something, such as participating in making Jakarta into a better city and also change his/her decision in the election (to choose AHY). The utterances are infelicitious because the speaker does not fulfill the sincerity condition out of the six component of felicity condition.

2. Indirect Speech Acts

Indirect promise

In delivering their vision and mission for Jakarta, the three candidates use speech acts to deliver their intentions. They usually promise to do something for citizens, to convince them so that they will be chosen in the election later. The promise act is uttered directly and also indirectly. In indirect promise, the speaker expresses his willingness to do something in future implicitly. We can see the analysis data below.

(Data 6) Ahok: *“Supaya kalau kami di lanjutkan lagi, bukan hanya visi misi program tercapai, tetapi Ahok nya sudah menjadi icore 7 bukan Pentium lagi kalo kalau computer.”*
“So if we went further, not only the vision and mission of the program is reached, but Ahok will become Icore 7 instead of Pentium if it is a computer.”

Here, Ahok ensures that his vision and mission could be accomplished if he and his partner are given an additional five years to come. In the utterance above, we can see that Ahok said it implicitly his intention. Instead of saying that he will be a better person, he uses computer processor as an analogy as the

explanation. We know that i-core 7 is more advanced than Pentium, which is so out of date for now. It will provide a greater and high quality program. Ahok explains it implicitly by saying those words. It makes it into indirect speech act. He intends to tell everyone that he has a better program if he is chosen for the next term.

The utterance is classified into commissive, because Ahok commits to do something in the future. Ahok shows a willingness to be a better government by his words implicitly. That utterance is a declarative sentence. The illocutionary forces of the indirect promise will be analyzed by using Vanderveken's theory.

1) Illocutionary Point

The point of the utterance is commissive, because Ahok commits to do something in future. He promises to people to become a greater governor than now, implicitly. Instead of saying he will learn to be better, he compared himself as a computer with an improved processor. He will improve his performance.

2) Mode of Achievement

Ahok expects people can see his potential by saying the words, to give people thoughts about their next program that will be advanced.

3) Propositional Content

The act of promise shows that Ahok is willing to do something in future for Jakarta. He has a greater program to come and accomplish what he is doing right now completely.

4) Preparatory Conditions

A promise brings a good effect for the hearer. If Ahok could have more polite behavior and more brilliant program for Jakarta, meaning it would give benefit for the citizens next.

5) Sincerity Condition

Ahok seems really sincere about his utterance. It is shown by facial expression. He also has already proven to the citizens of Jakarta that he was able to make a significant change to Jakarta. So, he is also confident of being able to do a better work again if re-elected.

6) Degree of Strength

The degree of strength of promise is considered high. He explained each of his missions with clear and measurable. His track record as the recent governor is also could be an appraisal.

The act of promise is classified into commissive speech act. It refers to Ahok's future action than promising a better person for Jakarta. He wants to make Jakarta into even greater than now. The speaker deliver their intentions using speech act to make the hearer do something, in this case is to re-elect them in the election. The utterance fulfills the six components. So, it is felicitous.

The Commissive Act by the Three Candidates

| Commissive | The candidates | | | Total |
|------------|----------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| | I | II | III | |
| Promise | 4 | 2 | 5 | 11 |
| Guarantee | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Volunteer | - | 2 | - | 2 |
| Threat | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Refusal | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Offer | - | - | - | - |
| Vow | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 4 (25%) | 4 (25%) | 8 (50%) | 16 (100%) |

From the table 4, we can see how each candidate uttered commissive acts in their vision and mission speech. The candidate that shows the most commissive acts in their utterances is the third candidate with 50%. They uttered 8 out of 16 commissive acts by all candidate. The other two candidate comes with the same percentage, 25% out of 100%. The most common found is a *promise*. In a campaign, promise probably gives a positive effect that brings hope to the hearer. The third candidate is the couple with the most promise act in their utterance with 45,45%, followed by the first candidate with 36,36% and the second candidate with 18,18%.

CONCLUSIONS

This research is concerned with the illocutionary forces in commissive act used by every candidate of governor election in Jakarta. The data are from a debate that were aired on television of CNN Indonesia and uploaded in Youtube. The data are only limited on the vision and mission section. In vision and mission section, the candidates most talk about their programs for the future if they are elected as the new governor. While giving explanation, each candidate uttered some utterances that indicates commissive speech act.

There are five commissive speech acts that were analyzed in this research, such as *guarantee*, *promise*, *threat*, *refusal*, and *volunteer*. After classifying the data, the writer concludes that commissive type that mostly found in this thesis is a promise. Promise is a statement of the candidate that will do or not to do something in the future. It will determine the candidate's act to commit to all Jakarta citizens whether they will do something in future or not. In order to be chosen by the citizens, promise perhaps brings a good emotion because it is convincing. The citizens could have a high expectation.

We can see that the candidates of governor election used many commissive speech acts while giving their speech. In a debate, each candidate does campaign, which delivers their messages to the hearer (audiences) about their future action. Every candidate shows different behavior. Utterances said by AHY were sounded like a recitation, so that makes it not sincere. While another candidate, Ahok and Djarot can explain their vision and mission clear and

convincing. The hearer can get what they mean by hearing the utterances. The third pair, Anies and Sandi, is in between. Some of the utterances are clear and seems sincere, and the other is just sound like a theory. The third candidate shows commissive act in their utterances more than the other candidate, and many of them are felicitous. The third candidate's utterances can achieve its purposes to the hearer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Garry; Arsenault, Nancy. 2005. *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. London: Routedledge Falmer.
- Kalangsari, Angela Thea. 2011. *Tindak Ilokusi Asertif dan Komisif Dalam Film The Devil Wears Prada*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, Jacob L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, John R. 1979. *Expressing and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Sudaryanto. 1988. *Metode Linguistik (Bagian Pertama: Ke Arah Memahami Metode Linguistik) Cetakan ke 2*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Sutopo, H B. 2002. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Surakarta : UNS Press.
- Vanderveken, Daniel. 1990. *Meaning and Speech Act*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu. 1996. *Dasar Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.
- William B, Michael; Stephen, Isaac. 1971. *Handbook in Research and Evaluation*. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Website Visit:
- Indonesia, CNN. *Debat Pilkada 2017*. Youtube. January 30th, 2017 on 19:22
WIB. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I-P6G9OAHVE>