COMMISSIVE SPEECH ACT IN THE FIRST DEBATE OF

JAKARTA GOVERNOR ELECTION 2017

A THESIS

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistics in English Department

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

Submitted by:

INTEN LIESTYORINI

NIM: 13020110141028

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY

SEMARANG

2017

PRONOUNCEMENT

The writer states truthfully that this thesis is compiled by her without taking any results from other researchers in S-1, S-2, S-3 and in diploma degree of any universities. In addition, the writer ascertains that she does not take the material from other publications or someone's work except for the references mentioned.

Semarang, April 25th 2017

Inten Liestyorini

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

"Work hard in silence, let your success be your noise"

Frank Ocean

"Have more than you show, speak less than you know"

William Shakespeare

"Man Jadda Wajada, someone who are really serious and persistent about his/her dreams, will succeed"

Negeri 5 Menara

This thesis is dedicated to my parents.

COMMISSIVE SPEECH ACT IN THE FIRST DEBATE OF

JAKARTA GOVERNOR ELECTION 2017

Written by:

Inten Liestyorini

NIM: 13020110141028

is approved by thesis advisor

on April, 25th 2017

Thesis Advisor,

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum.

NIP. 196610041990012001

The Head of English Department,

Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M. A.

NIP 196408141990011001

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata I Thesis Examination Comitee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

on May, 19th 2017

Chair Member,   Second Member,

Dr. J. Herudjati Purwoko, M.Sc   Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum.

NIP. 195303271981031006   NIP. 196111091987032001

Third Member,   Fourth Member,

Dra. Cut Aja Puan Ellysafni, M.Ed   Dra. Wiwiek Sundari, M.Hum.

NIP. 195510031978122001   NIP. 195906071990032001

7. The writer's beloved friends since high school: Shelly, Inta, and Feby for the unforgettable moments and support.

8. The writer's beloved friends since junior high school: Tata, Annisa, Anies, Ajeng, Maria, Mput, Rury, and Dewi for their forces to me to finish this final thesis.

9. All lecturers at Faculty of Humanities, especially in the English Department and all staff in this Faculty.

10. For all related people who always support the writer to complete this project.

The writer realizes that this thesis is still far from being perfect. Therefore, she will be glad to receive any constructive critisism and recommendation to make this thesis better.

Finally, the writer expects that this thesis will be useful to the reader who wishes to know about the use of commissive speech act in real life conversation and the act derived by it.

Semarang, April 25th 2017

Inten Liestyorini

Table of Contents

v

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, threathen, 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*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background of the Study

As a human being, we need to socialize with others. Language is the most important thing that is needed in interaction with other humans. It is formed by a number of components that are patterned permanently and can be interpreted. On the other side, language is dynamic, which means that language is inseparable from a variety of possible changes that may occur at any time. It is also a social interaction tool to communicate with other human beings. As a primary thing of communication, language is used to express feelings, thoughts, ideas, intentions and emotions. In a conversation, usually people use spoken language. Besides it is more efficient, people will easily understand what the purpose and goals of the speaker in saying what they said. It depends on the context of the pronunciation of the speaker and how it wants to achieve the goal to convey the meaning. It is capable of expressing a sense and to do an action. The action itself is known as speech acts. Every utterance included an action is called speech acts. Speech act used by speaker has functions such as to express feeling, to ask, to give command, etc.

Speech acts can be found not only in a real life conversation, but also in a television program, movies, and many other occasions. In a talk show program on

television, it usually contained a dialog between the interviewer (host of the show) and the guest. It is the same thing in a debate that involves many parties in it. The debate of the candidates for governor is a routine which is always held before the election. In this thesis, the writer chooses a debate as the object because we can see the speech acts are used by the speaker in real life conversation. In a debate, usually there will be so many kinds of speech acts. However, the writer only chooses to focus on only one kind of speech acts, which is *commissive.* The reason why the writer chooses commissive as the focus is because while doing a debate, every candidate does campaign by explaining about their vision and mission. It is related to their action in the future. In a debate, there are many activities, such as explaining purposes, asking questions, interrogating, accusing, or anything else that the moderator and the candidates do. The writer only analyzes the vision and mission of each candidate as the object of this thesis. Topic that is taken in this thesis is the governor election of Jakarta. The writer chooses the Jakarta gubernatorial election because currently it is in the spotlight throughout the community. The governor candidates are the concern in this election. At this time, the candidates in the election for governor of Jakarta are hit by political issues that make people more attentive than other local elections.

This thesis is entitled **Commissive Speech Act in the First Debate of Jakarta Governor Election 2017.**

1.2 Previous Studies

In doing this thesis, the writer refers to some previous studies in the similar field. As far as the writer observed, there are some students in English department students in Diponegoro University who already observed the similar study. The writer found a thesis that is related to this analysis. The writer chooses a thesis by Angela Thea Kalangsari (2011), with the title "Tindak Ilokusi Asertif dan Komisif Dalam Film The Devil Wears Prada" as the previous study. She informed the reader about kinds of speech acts that were found in the movie entitled *The Devil Wears Prada*. In her thesis, she classified the speech acts and explained the illocutionary acts in the script. She chose Austin (1962) theory to do the illocutionary speech act classification, and Vanderveken (1990) to analyze the illocutionary acts. She classified the commissive acts into Vanderveken's classification, while the writer uses Searle's.

In analyzing data, the writer of the previous studies focused more on the assertive type than on the commissive one. She explained only two commissive data in her analysis, which were *threat* and *promise*. In this thesis, the writer only focused on commisive act and explains it more than what the writer in previous study did. In doing this thesis, the writer will use different object. While the previous study chose film as the object, the writer chooses a real life conversation, a debate, as the object.

Another thesis is by Fiersta Wasiska Juniar (2014), with her thesis entitled "The Illocutionary Meaning Intended by Karni Ilyas in Anchoring the Indonesia Lawyer Club". She used the theory of Searle in Cutting (2008) to classify the

kinds of speech acts. She analyzed four types of felicity condition, which are propositional content conditional, preparatory condition, sincerity condition, and essential condition by Searle (1994). She used different theory in classifying the speech acts.

These are another thesis by another researchers that were considered as the previous studies, which are Sundiyah (2010) with a thesis entitled "Tindak Ilokusi Dalam Kajian Tasqif di Masjid Baitunnaim Pleburan Semarang", Nur Said (2013) with his thesis entitled "Illocutionary Forces on the Lyrics of Ungu's Religious Song in Religi Album", and Meyta Wahyu Prima (2006) with her thesis entitled "The Analysis of Illocutionary Acts in Business Conversations". The three researchers above used the same theory in analyzing the illocutionary forces and in classifying the commisive performative verbs. They used kinds of commissive and illocutionary forces indicating device theories by Vanderveken (1990). In her thesis, Sundiyah (2010) only found a type of commisive. It was an *offer*. While in Meyta Wahyu Prima (2006)'s thesis, Meyta only found a type of commissive act, which was *commits*. Nur Said (2013) could not find any of commissive speech acts in his data. These researchers were not quite clear in explaining each component of illocutionary forces.

1.3   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 commisive speech act found in the object?

1.4   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.

1.5   Scope of the study

The writer only focuses on the utterances that are spoken by each candidate in the vision and mission section. The study limited the object to the first debate of governor election of DKI Jakarta only aired on CNN Indonesia channel on Youtube. The writer only analyzes one type of illocutionary speech acts, which is commisive act. There are seven types of commissive act, such as *guarantee, promise, threat, refusal, offer, volunteer* and *vow*.

1.6   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.

1.7   Writing Organization

The writer arranges this research report into some chapters in order to make it easily readable. Below is a brief explanation about the content of each chapter:

Chapter I   : INTRODUCTION

Introduction is about research conceptualization problem consisting of background of the study, research method; purposes of the study; scope of the study; and writing organization.

Chapter II   : REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter explores the theories applied in this research. It describes the theories that are related to the study about register and meaning change.

Chapter III   : RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter deals with type of the research, data and source of the data, and method of collecting and analyzing the data.

Chapter IV   : FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter explains the findings from the research and discussion of the data.

Chapter V   : CONCLUSION

It is a closing chapter that contains the conclusion of whole analysis according to the result of the research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Speech Acts

Wijana stated that when people say something, they did not only state something but also do an action with the words (1996:23). A knowledge about speech acts is the way of expressing an utterance and the intention of the speakers. The speakers do not only produce utterances in a correct grammatical structure and word, but also perform actions by saying those utterances to reach their purpose (Yule, 1996:47). The speaker also has to package the message in such a right way so that the message can be delivered and understood well by the listener. Speech act are actions that are happening in the world. They bring about a change in the existing state of affairs (hence the label 'performative utterance' which originally was attached to them (Mey, 1993:111-112).

Yule classifies speech acts into three types, which are locution, illocution, and perlocution (1996:48).

2.1.1 Locutionary acts

Yule (1996:48) reported that locutionary act is the basis of utterance of producing a meaningful linguistic expression. The speakers say something without any intention to the listener. They don't intend to make the listener do

something by the words they utter. In short, it is called the act of saying something.

2.1.2   Illocutionary acts

Vanderveken stated that illocutionary acts are the main unit of the literal meaning in the use and understanding of natural language (1990:11). Yule said illocutionary acts are certain communicative purpose made by the speaker or actions performed via communicative force or utterance, such as performing, apologizing, offering, questioning, etc (1996:48). So, we can conclude that usually the speaker does an act by saying something.

(1)   Example: "I have just cooked chicken soup and spicy chicken wings. Want to give it a try?"

From the example (1), the speaker talks to the listener that she/he just cooks something. The expression "want to give it a try?" indicates that she/he offers the meal to the listener. The speaker wants the listener to try his/her new recipes of meal, which are chicken soup and spicy chicken wings.

2.1.3   Perlocutionary acts

Perlocutionary act is an act as the effect of the words spoken by the speaker. It refers to the response given by the listener after listening to the words spoken by the speaker (Yule, 1996:48). When the speaker utters something, she intends to make the listener do something and to get affected by it. It is not directly said by the speaker, but she/he says something to make the listener understand and does what she/he wants.

2.2   Illocutionary Types

2.2.1   Declaration

By saying words, a person is able to change the status of the listener. This kind of speech act is classified into declaration. The speaker changes status only by its utterance (Yule, 1996:53).

2.2.2   Representative

Representative is a kind of speech act that reveals what the speaker believes (Yule, 1996:53). The purpose of the speaker's utterances is to make the words fit to the world. When we talk about representative speech acts, it is usually talking about fact, assertive, and conclusion.

2.2.3   Expressive

Expressive speech act is where a speaker intends that its utterance is interpreted as an evaluation of the things mentioned in its words. It deals with the feelings of the speaker itself. Typically, when a speaker says something, it described its feelings. As examples of speech that is expressive, such as, praising someone, approving, expressing guilty, claiming, welcoming, apologizing, etc. The utterances express feelings.

2.2.4   Directive

Directive speech act is a kind of speech act that is spoken by the speaker in order to make the other person do what he says through its statements. The examples of directive speech act are requesting, asking, ordering, interrogating, proposing, suggesting, etc. Those expressions can be positive or negative. These

acts express the speaker intention and the speaker makes the world fit the words (Yule, 1996: 54).

2.2.5   Commissive

In this thesis, the writer is going to focus only on one type of speech act, which is commissive. When someone utters the words that are promising something or committed through words, it is the purpose of commissive speech act. Commissive is a kind of speech act that tells an act related to what will be done in the future. This speech act expresses the speaker's intention. There will be an essential condition that implies the intention to make an obligation. Using commisive speech act, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words (Yule, 1996: 54).   Yule said that the speaker expresses promises, guarantees, refusals, pledges, and etc by using commissive speech act (1996:54). Similarly, Searle reported the performative verbs that indicate commissive speech acts are *promise, guarantee, refusals, volunteer, offer, threat* and *vow* (1979:22). The following is a brief explanation of each type.

a)   Promise

Promise is an act of the speaker that he/she will do or will not do anything in the future. It will determine the speaker's act to commit to another person whether he/she will do it or not. See the following example,

(2)   Example: "I promise to always be by your side.

b)   Guarantee

A guarantee is a type of commissive speech act that is assertive and firm. When a speaker talks about something and guarantees it, it means he/she has to be responsible. He/she will exactly do it in the future, or something he/she said is true. It affirms quality of something. The differences between a promise and guarantee are the level of assertiveness and confidence the speaker with what he will do. Typically, the guarantee is firmer than just a promise. See the following example.

(3)   Example: "This device works really well, I guarantee!"

In the example (3), the word 'guarantee' shows that the speaker convinces the listener about thing. The statement must be a truth. The speaker has to be responsible if the device is not working the way he said before.

c)   Refusals

Refusal is a form of unwillingness of the speakers at the request he has received. It shows a negative response to a request and suggestion. The rejection of this will affect the things that will be done by the speakers in the future.

(4)   Example:

A: "Can you invite me to the party?"

B: "I don't think I can do it."

From the conversation in example (4), we can consider the situation as a friend asking for a help from the speaker. The words that the speaker said shows that he has no will to do it in the future. B (as the speaker) rejects a request from A.

d)   Volunteer

Volunteer is doing a service without being asked. It is when a person freely offers to take part in an enterprise or undertake a task. The speaker freely offers a help without being forced, whether to work, to say something, and to suggest something with his/her own will.

(5)   Example: "I volunteer to help arranging things for the wedding!"

e)   Offer

An offer is when the speaker is willing to do something for the hearer. It can be a help, or something to give too.

(6)   Example: "I will drive you to home."

f)   Threats

Threat is a statement said by the speaker to give snapping to the listener. The listener will be intimidated by the words that are pronounced by the speakers. Threats are usually supported by a distrust of the speakers with a reason.

g)   Vow

Vow is a solemn or earnest pledge that the speakers do to perform a specified act or behave in a certain way. It also can be a promise to a deity or saint, by which the promise pledges someone to some future act, course of action, or way of life.

2.3   Type of Speech Acts

Yule (1996:54) reported that there are two types of speech acts. They refer to the relation between the function of the utterance with the word forms. Direct speech act is the type that the function of speech acts is the same as the utterances said by the speaker. We can understand the purpose of the utterances said exactly like what the speaker said to the listener. We can say that direct speech act has explicit meaning on it. When the speaker uses a performative verb, it indicates direct speech act. Another type of speech act is indirect speech act. When a speaker says something, usually it has different intention from the used words. The speaker says something with implicit meaning to get their intention to the listener. There is no relation between the function of utterance with the word forms. We can see from the example below.

(7)   Example: "I ask you to leave"

From the example above, we can see that there are relationship between the words and its function. The speaker literally means his/her intention through the words said. The function of each sentence is to make the listener do or answer his/her words by using speech act. The speaker wants the listener to leave.

(8)   Example of indirect speech acts:

a)   A: "Mom, I want to make a cup of tea, but there is no sugar."

b)   B: "Here is the money. Go buy to the nearest supermarket."

These utterances are said by the son to his mother. The function is not directly shown in the sentence. The intention of the son's words is asking for money to his mother, so that he can buy sugar to make a cup of tea.

2.4   IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device)

Yule (1996:51) stated that Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID) is used to know what kind of illocutionary force in the utterances spoken by the speaker. A performative verb is one of IFID that used as the indicator in the speaker's utterance. There are examples of performative verb, which are *promise, commit, warn*, etc. When the speakers say the performative verb in the utterance, it is a direct speech act.

The speakers do not always state the preformative verb explicitly. Sometimes they state the performative verb implicitly. There are other devices of IFID that can be used to analyze the implicit performative verb. Yule (1996:49) reported that there are four Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices, such as performative verb, word order, stress and intonation, and voice quality.

a)   Performative Verb (Vp)

Th example of performative verb (Vp) are promise and warn.

For example: I promise you that ..., or

I warn you that ...

b)   Word Order

Word order is used by the speaker to give the pressure of the speaker 'intention'

For example:

Him : Can I talk to Marry?

Her : No, she's not here.

Him : I'm asking you, can I talk to her?

Her : And I'm telling you, SHE'S NOT HERE!

(Yule, 1996:50)

In the example above, the speaker changes the sentence from "No, she's not here" to be "And I'm telling you, SHE'S NOT HERE!" to convince the hearer about what the speaker says.

c) Stress and Intonation

Sometimes different stress and intonation are used to make different meaning of the utterances.

Example:

a) You're going! [I tell you, you should be going)

b) You're going? [I request confirmation about you are going)

c) Are you going? [I ask you if you are going]

For the explanation above, there are different meanings in different stress and intonation about the sentence "You're going" (Yule, 1996:50)

d) Voice Quality

The voice quality also indicates the illocutionary force. For example: lowered voice may indicate 'warn' or 'threat'.

2.5   Felicity Condition

When the speakers use speech acts, they have intention to make the listener do something by their utterances. When the listener get affected by the speaker's utterances, we can conclude that the speech act does a successful performance. There is also satisfaction for the speaker when the listener gets to know what they should do after hearing utterances from the speaker. According to Levinson,

> Illocutionary force is an aspect of meaning, broadly construed, that is quite irreducible to matters of truth and falsity. It constitutes an inherent speech act function on an utterance by indicating how those descriptions are to be taken or what the addressee is meant to do with a particular proposition that is expressed (1983: 246).

In order to reach the purpose of an utterance, Vanderveken (1990:104-121) classifies illocutionary forces into six components to be fulfilled.

(1)   Illocutionary Point

Illocutionary point refers to the point of utterances for determining the contents of the words itself. For example, if someone complains about something, the point is to make the listener do something about this.

(2)   Mode of Achievement

The mode of achievement of illocutionary is the component of that force which determines how its point must be achieved on the propositional content in a successful performance of an act with that force.

(3)   Propositional Content

This component is supposed to express judgement, opinion or a matter to be dealt with. The propositional content can represent actual future as well as past or present state of affair. For example, the propositional content of a promise must represent a speaker's future course of action.

(4)   Preparatory Conditions

This concerns the truth of certain propositions in the context of utterance. The speaker commits himself to do something that he is capable to do it.

(5)   Sincerity Conditions

A speaker expresses their attitude toward the state of affairs represented by the propositional condition. If a speaker promises something, it expresses that he has purpose to accomplish and able to do it.

(6)   A Degree of Strength

Sincerity condition of speech acts is expressed with different strength on the illocutionary forces. The degree of strength from sincerity conditions of swears is greater than a speaker who attests. If an illocutionary force has those six components, it is felicitous.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

In obtaining and analyzing the data, there were some research methods used in the thesis. A *method* is a *kind* of systematical *work plan* in *order* to *make* the *researcher's work become easier, so* that it *can achieve its main purpose (Sudaryanto, 1993:9).* In the step of collecting data and analyzing the data on a thesis, we need a proper method in the determination. The method used must be in accordance with our goals in writing this thesis.

In this chapter, the writer presents the process of collecting and analyzing the data. The writer explains the method of how the writer collected the data and how to analyze the obtained data. The method is considered appropriate if the method is successful in helping me to write this thesis and the objectives set, also answers the research poblems.

3.1. Type of the Research

The type of this research is a descriptive qualitative research. Descriptive method is a research method that describes a situation or area of interest (linguistic) systematically, factually, and accurately (Michael and Isaac, 1971:42). According to Anderson (2006:1), a qualitative research is collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data by observing what people do and say. Qualitative research refers to the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols,

and descriptions of things. By using this research method, the writer presented the classification of illocutionary acts found into commissive act, and explained the illocutionary forces of the utterances said by the three candidates.

The reason why the writer used a qualitative research to analyze the research is because the data collected especially in the form of words, sentences or pictures have more meaning than number or quantity/frequency (Sutopo, 2002:35). The writer obtained the data in the form of phrases or sentences, and explained the speech act in data analysis. The writer described each type of the data, the type of speech acts, and the illocutionary forces.

3.2   Data and Source of Data

Sudaryanto (1988:10) said that data are the research object along with the context. It can be facts, events, or information collected by researchers while doing a research project. The data chosen in this thesis are phrases and sentences in an election debate of governor of DKI Jakarta candidates assumed containing commissive acts. The focus is on what the three candidates said during the debate. The video itself was downloaded on a video provider on the internet called YouTube (www.youtube.com), specifically in CNN Indonesia Channel.

3.3   Population and Sample

In this part, the writer reported the population in this research. Population is an aggregate or totality of all the objects, subjects or members that conform to a set of specifications. The population in this thesis is all phrases and sentences spoken by all three candidates that indicate commissive illocutionary acts. Those

phrases and sentences were obtained from a election debate aired on a channel of CNN Indonesia. The data research is limited only an episode, entitled Debat Pilkada DKI Jakarta 2017 aired on January 13, 2017.

After the population is obtained, the writer took a sample. The samples were chosen when the candidates gave explanation about their vision and mission. While watching and taking notes, the writer classified the illocutionary acts found into only commissive act. After that, the writer analyzed the illocutionary forces of it.

3.4   Method of Collecting Data

Sudaryanto (1993:20) reported that there are three steps in collecting data, those are:

1. collecting the data, and then taking a note,

2. sorting the data and throwing the unused data,

3. taking note based on its classifications.

The data obtained are sentences spoken by all candidates. The writer collected the data of the research from a website in the internet called YouTube, specifically on CNN Indonesia channel. In addition, the writer also used the method of note-taking to the next step. After that, the writer classified the data found into commissive speech acts. Furthermore, the writer was the instrument to analyze the data through watching, taking notes, identifying, classifying, and then analyzing.

3.5   Method of Analyzing Data

The writer analyzed the speaker's utterances. Sudaryanto stated that *Metode Agih* is used when the factor of th analysis comes from the language itself (1993:15). The *Agih* method was used because the analysis is about the features in the language. The purpose of analyzing the data is to give knowledge to the people in linguistic field and also the reader about speech acts, especially commissive act. In analyzing the data obtained, the writer used these steps to achieve the goals, which are:

1.   identifying various kinds of illocutionary acts that uttered by three candidates,

2.   classifying the data found into commissive types of illocutionary acts,

3.   explaining the illocutionary forces of the data,

4.   giving explanation about the purpose of utterances of the data.

CHAPTER 4

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The utterances spoken by each candidate on the debate will be classified into types of speech acts, consisting of direct and indirect speech acts. I only focus on the commissive type. There are kinds of illocutionary forces found in commissive illocutionary acts, such as *guarantee, promise, threat, refusal, offer, volunteer* and *vow*.

The data taken are the utterances spoken by the three candidates on the first debate of governor election in Jakarta. The first candidate is a couple of Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono (AHY) and Sylviana Murni. Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok) and Djarot Saiful Hidayat are the second candidate. The last one, the third candidate is a couple of Anies Baswedan and Sandiaga Uno. The chosen data are only in the vision and mission section. Candidate utterances will be presented in different tables. The utterances spoken by each candidate will be shown in the table and classified one by one. The writer explains some of the data found in the chapter 4.

See the following table on the next page.

Table 1. The Commissive Acts Classification of the First Candidate

Utterances	Type of Speech Acts	Illocutionary Forces
Data 1	Direct	Promise
Data 2	Indirect	Promise
Data 3	Direct	Promise
Data 4	Direct	Promise

Table 2. The Commissive Acts Classification of the Second Candidate

Utterances	Type of Speech Acts	Illocutionary Forces
Data 5	Indirect	Volunteer
Data 6	Indirect	Promise
Data 15	Direct	Promise
Data 16	Indirect	Volunteer

Table 3. The Commissive Acts Classification of the Third Candidate

Utterances	Type of Speech Acts	Illocutionary Forces
Data 7	Direct	Refusal
Data 8	Direct	Guarantee
Data 9	Indirect	Promise
Data 10	Indirect	Promise
Data 11	Direct	Promise
Data 12	Direct	Threat
Data 13	Direct	Promise
Data 14	Direct	Promise

As shown in the tables of three candidates, they used direct and indirect speech acts. The commisive acts which are found in the vision and mission section are *guarantee, promise, threat, refusal,* and *volunteer*. All utterances in the data are declarative sentences. We can see that the third candidate is the most often in using commissive act in the vision and mission section. The most common type that was used by the candidates is *promise.*

**1.	Direct Speech Acts**

**1.1	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 feliticious. 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 commisives, 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 infeliticious because the speaker does not fulfill the sincerity condition out of the six component of felicity condition.

Another data analysis,

(Data 1) AHY: *"Visi saya 5 tahun kedepan adalah menjadikan Jakarta semakin maju, aman, adil, dan sejahtera."*
"My vision for the next five years is to make Jakarta to be advanced, secure, equitable, and prosperous."

In the first section of the debate, each candidate is given a chance to promote their vision and mission. While explaining the vision and mission of the first candidate, AHY used speech act to deliver his message to the audience. He uttered a declarative sentence, because he just explained his vision and mission without doing command or asking the hearer to do something. There is no performative verb stated in the utterance. However, the words "the next five years" shows that it is a commisive act. The words have the same relation with the function, so it is direct speech act. We can get that what AHY intends to do is he promises to do something for Jakarta. See the data below.

(Data 1) AHY: *"Visi saya 5 tahun kedepan adalah <u>(Saya akan)</u>menjadikan Jakarta semakin maju, aman, adil, dan sejahtera."*
"My vision for the next five years is <u>(I will)</u> to make Jakarta to be advanced, secure, equitable, and prosperous."

The first subject in the utterance is first person plural, because AHY is a representative of the first candidate. The object is Jakarta residents as the hearer.

By using Yule's speech act classification, the utterance is classified into commissive. The utterance shows the act of a promise. He commits to everyone about their vision and mission if they are elected. He shows that he will make Jakarta to be advanced, secure, equitable, and prosperous in future.

The felicity condition of the act of direct promise in the utterance above will be analyzed using Vanderveken's theory.

1)   Illocutionary Point

The point of the utterance is commisive, because AHY's utterance refers to future act of the first candidate. He explains his promise of making Jakarta to be a better city to the audiences.

2)   Mode of Achievement

AHY hopes that people in Jakarta can change their opinion about the first candidate because of his seriousness to help Jakarta to be more advanced than before.

3)   Propositional Content

The utterance refers to the future act and committed by the speaker (AHY/ The first pair candidate), means that they promise to make Jakarta to be advanced, secure, equitable, and prosperous.

4)   Preparatory Conditions

The promise act of an utterance should give good effect to the hearer. In this case, people in Jakarta will get what AHY promises to them in the future if he got elected.

5)   Sincerity Condition

AHY did not seem like too sincere since the words looks too strict, and he said it like a recitation.

6)   Degree of Strength

The degree of strength of the promise is lower than guarantee. The words he said is considered not clearly and too general.

In short, the act of promise is classified into commissive speech act. AHY promises to make Jakarta to be advanced, secure, equitable, and prosperous. The utterances said by the speaker purposes to make the hearer convinced with his vision and mission.The utterance is judged as infelicitious.

1.2   Direct Guarantee

The third candidate expresses the following statement, like in the datum 8 that is served as a guarantee.

(Data 8) ANIES: *"Kami hadir berdua untuk memastikan kesejahteraan dan keadilan hadir untuk seluruh warga Jakarta."*
"We are here to ensure the prosperity and justice presented to all of you, Jakarta citizens."

Based on the utterance in fragment 8, the third candidate expressed their presence as the next governor. It is served as a guarantee to the people of Jakarta.

He intends to make sure the whole community will get welfare and justice in this country. The utterance above is declarative sentence, because he just says something without intending to ask something or tell listener to do something in respond.

Guarantee is one way for each candidate to campaign, so that society feels secure. The word "ensure", makes the act of guarantee. The speaker should be responsible for what he said. The use of the word "ensure" provides an explicit illocution. The utterance is a direct speech act. The subject is the first person plural, because the speaker said We/Kami, referring to himself and the candidate for vice governor. The action is being uttered at the time of speaking. The direct object is the second plural person, which are all audience (Jakarta residents).

Using Yule's speech act classification, the utterance is classified into commissive. It is because the third candidate pair commits to everyone about their future action. They guarantee people's welfare in Jakarta if they got chosen later. It might be, for example, providing a better job vacancy, better facilities and education. This things help people become welfare.

The act of guarantee in the utterance in fragment 8 will be judged felicitous or infelicitous. In order to know whether it is felicitious or not, the utterance is analyzed. If it fulfills the six components, then it can achieves the speaker's purpose.

1)   Illocutionary Point

The point of the utterance said by Anies is commissive, because he commits to carry out the future action (guarantying citizen's welfare).

2)   Mode of Achievement

Anies, as the governor, guarantee the prosperity and justice for Jakarta citizens. He believes that taking care of the citizen's life is the government duty.

3)   Propositional Content

The utterance refers to the third candidate's future act. It will be carried out by them. It means that they will commit themselves to guarantee all Jakarta citizens' welfare. They may provides many job vacancy so they can improve Jakarta residents's economic.

4)   Preparatory Condition

Guarantee has to be advantageous for the citizens of Jakarta that is if people choose them as the new governor instead of another candidates, their prosperity should be guaranteed. If the citizen does not have a better life, then the first candidate is willing to take the risk. They might not continue being a governor in next term since they lose citizen's trusts.

5)   Sincerity Condition

The speaker does not seem very sincere, because he said it in a debate. He might say this for the sake of a campaign. He just said that he will guarantee Jakarta citizen's welfare, and it is like a common thing to say for every candidate to win a competition. The intonation is also low.

6)   Degree of Strength

The act of a guarantee has a lower strength than a promise. Anies, as the speaker, said "We are here to make sure the prosperity and justice". It does

not make the hearer get what they mean, because they did not really show how to achieve that to the hearer.

In brief, the act of guarantee is commissive type because it shows that the speaker said that he will make sure about what happen in the future. He guarantee that he will solve the problem of people's prosperity and justice in Jakarta later. With the statement, the speaker can convince the listener to do something, in this term, choose them if they want them to accomplish that mission. The writer thinks the utterance is infeliticious, because the speaker does not fulfill the six components.

1.3   Direct Refusal

In a campaign, besides promising what they are going to do in future, they also tell people about what they refuse to do. In the following utterance, it shows the act of refusal done by the third candidate.

(Data 7) ANIES: *"Kami datang ke Jakarta membawa pengalaman, pengetahuan, dan akumulasi jaringan. Kami menempatkan Jakarta bukan tempat uji coba."*
"We come to Jakarta along with experiences, knowledge, and the accumulation of networking. We refuse to make Jakarta as a place for trial."

Based on the fragment above, the utterance shows that he gives refusal in his words. A refusal is when the speaker does not agree about something he will do in future. It is rejection that will affect the future action of the third candidate. Anies and Sandi refuse to make Jakarta as the place for a trial. They think that, usually, a candidate promises may things for the residents' only for winning the election. They do the mission they've promised but not doing it seriously.

The word "refuse" in the utterances *"we refuse to make Jakarta as a place for trial"* indicates Anies using refusal speech acts to deliver his intention. It shows that he refuses something to be done in the future. It is a direct speech acts, because the performative verb "refuse" is explicitly stated in the utterance. It makes the form of words explain the meaning explicitly. The subject is the first person plural, because the speaker said We/Kami, referring to the third candidate pairs. While, the object is second person plural, which are the people in Jakarta citizen. The type of sentence is declarative.

Next, it is classified into commissive speech act based on Yule's classification. Anies refuses to do something in the future. He does not want to make Jakarta as the place for trial only. It means that he will not make Jakarta as the place for trial if the third candidate is selected as the new governor in future. He wants to help solving problems of Jakarta clearly and seriously.

The speaker's utterance has to fulfill the six components of felicity conditions in order to achieve the goal. The act of refusal will be analyzed using Vanderveken's theory of illocutionary acts.

1)   Illocutionary Point

       The illocutionary point of the utterance is refusal, because Anies said he does not want to make Jakarta as a place for trial. He refuses to not seriously work for Jakarta.

2)   Mode of Achievement

       Anies said that he will not make Jakarta as place for trial. Actually, there are options for them to work seriously or not. However, he refuses to not

work properly by saying that utterance above. The utterance "We refuse to make Jakarta as a place for trial" emphasized that he shows a refusal. He hopes that the audience can see his seriousness to change Jakarta be a better city. He hopes people will see that the third candidate is truly cares about the citizens.

3) Propositional Content

The utterance refers to the third candidate's future act. They will work to improve Jakarta properly and seriously. They will earnestly work and do not make Jakarta as an experiment to measure their abilities.

4) Preparatory Condition

A refusal is used to show that Anies and Sandi will not make Jakarta as a trial in future. They want to work properly and do their best. They show to people that they really care about them.

5) Sincerity Condition

The first candidate seems honestly refuses to make Jakarta as a place for trial. In the previous utterance, Anies explain that he and Sandi come to Jakarta with their experiences, knowledge, and the accumulation of networking. He assumes that they are able to work earnestly for Jakarta together.

6) Degree of Strength

The degree of strength of the refusal above is high. Anies feels that he and his partner, Sandi, are capable to give Jakarta a good performance. He refused to work unprofessionally if they are elected as the next governor.

His words can convince the hearer, because he was ever been an

influential figure in government.

In brief, the act of refusal is commissive because it shows that the speaker

is not willing to do in future. He will not make Jakarta as a place for trial by

saying that utterance, meaning that he refuses to do that in future. In the statement

above, a refusal uses to make the hearer convinced that Anies and Sandi will work

professionally if they are chosen. The utterance is feliticious, because it fulfills the

six components of illocutionary forces.

1.4   Direct Threat

In the following speech, the third candidate describes his mission to

combat drugs in the city of Jakarta. He said that he rejected the drug circulating in

the city. He would follow up with the firm for citizens who consume drugs by

providing appropriate legal sanctions.

(Data 12) ANIES: *"Tidak ada sedikitpun toleransi, karena seluruh ikhtiar kita menjadi tak bermakna begitu hadir narkoba."*
"There will be no tolerance, because all the effort would be meaningless when drugs come up."

Based on the fragment above (data 12), the utterance spoken by Anies is showing

that he wants people to obey the rules by a threat. A threat usually is used to make

the listener feels intimidated by the words, which are pronounced by the speaker.

Threats are usually supported by a distrust of the speakers with a reason. In this

utterance, the reason is because so many cases about drugs nowadays. The impact

is very dangerous for teenagers's future life. Anies explained that all the hard

work and effort would be useless if there are drugs. He believes that drugs would make disadvantages for people who use it, and give the worst result in the end, so he threathen Jakarta residents as the hearer.

Based on Yule classification of speech acts, the threat above is a commissive speech act. Anies said "There will be no tolerance" makes it obvious that his utterance shows a threat. In another words, it could be said as "I warn you that there's no tolerance for drugs". That words show that Anies really cannot give any tolerance for those people who consume drugs. It means that, in the future, Anies and Sandi will firm to eradicate drugs in Jakarta. The utterance is a declarative sentence, because it is said only to warn people about drugs. It is a direct speech act, because the words "There will be no tolerance" showing that he will punish people who consume drugs and might want to eradicate drugs. The performative verb "will" shows a future action. It makes it into direct threat. The subject is the first person plural, because the speaker refers to himself and the hearer. Eradicating drugs is not only the government's job, but also the society.

The act of threat will be judged felicitous or infelicitous by using the theory of illocutionary force by Vanderveken.

1)   Illocutionary Point

The illocutionary point of the threat act is commissive, because Anies refers to the third candidate's action in future. The utterance shows that the speaker is not going to be tolerant with the existence of drugs.

2) Mode of Achievement

By using threat act, Anies expects there will be nobody using drugs anymore in the future. He hopes that people's life will be safe and secured with eradicate drugs from the city.

3) Propositional Content

The utterance refers to the third candidate's future act. It will be carried out by them, meaning that they will work to improve the quality of people in Jakarta by wipe the drugs out of Jakarta.

4) Preparatory Condition

A threat is used to wipe the drugs out from Jakarta. Anies and Sandi commit to do it in the future if they are chosen as the next governor. It gives advantages for people.

5) Sincerity Condition

The speaker is really firm about his threat. The look on his face while saying the utterance was very serious. The voice is also strong. There was also an emphasis on his voice. The hand gesture showed his excitement.

6) Degree of Strength

The degree of strength of a threat is high. Citizens know the fact that drugs can bring a bad effect for people's life.

In brief, the act of threat is commissive because it shows the speaker's future act if drugs found in the society. A threat above used to make the hearer convinced that Anies and Sandi are really cares about citizens' life. The speaker

also wants people to realize that drugs are bad for them. The utterance is judged as feliticious because it has the six components.

2. Indirect Speech Acts

2.1 Indirect Volunteer

In the following utterance, Ahok tells the audience that he wants to volunteer himself to be a better behavior just like Djarot, his partner. It is because people always complain about his 'rude' behavior.

(Data 5) Ahok: *"Saya juga belajar terus supaya belajar dari mas djarot namanya juga Djarot Syaiful Hidayat, supaya saya agak agak mirip dengan beliau"*
"I also keep learning from Mr. Djarot, just like his name Djarot Syaiful Hidayat, so that I will be more alike with him."

The utterance is classified into commissive by using Yule's speech act classification. It is because Ahok commits to everyone about his future action. The utterance above was said by Ahok as he wants to volunteer himself to change his behavior. The act above is classified into volunteer, because Ahok respond to people's opinion about his behavior while being a governor in Jakarta. He intends to change his behavior for people, even though he does not need to. He does not need to behave like what everyone told him to, but he volunteers himself so that everyone would be happy too. It is not categorized as a promise, since Ahok did not promise anything to everyone so that everyone could not ask his responsibility by his words.

The utterance spoken by Ahok is a declarative sentence. It is because he only explains without expects anyone's respond to his words. The speaker's utterance is considered as an indirect speech act. The performative verb that shows a volunteer is not stated in the utterance. It shows that it has implicit illocution. We can conclude his utterances with add an additional words to show that it is a volunteer act.

(Data 5) Ahok: *"Saya juga (akan bersuka rela) belajar terus supaya belajar dari mas djarot namanya juga djarot syaeful hidayat supaya saya agak agak mirip dengan beliau"*
"I also (will volunteer to) keep learning from Mr. Djarot, just like his name Djarot Syaiful Hidayat, so that I will be more alike with him."

The subject is the first person singular, because Ahok refers to only himself. The direct object is second person singular, which is his partner, Djarot Syaiful Hidayat. In order to achieve the utterance's purpose, the speaker's utterance need to fulfill the six components of felicity condition. The act of volunteer above will be analyzed whether it is felicitious or infelicitious by using Vanderveken's theory.

1) Illocutionary Point

The point of the utterance is commisive, because Ahok commits to do something in future. He volunteers himself to follow Jakarta citizen's opinion about his behavior to become more polite like Mr. Djarot. He does not said explicitly that he wants to change his behavior to be better. It makes it into indirect point.

2)   Mode of Achievement

Ahok hopes people can see that people's opinion about his behavior is important for him. He intends to satisfy people's expectation and convince that the second pair candidate will be better if they are chosen for the next term, so citizen will choose them in the election.

3)   Propositional Content

The utterance refers to the future act and committed by the speaker (Ahok), means that Ahok will volunteer himself to do something for the citizens.

4)   Preparatory Conditions

The volunteer act must give a benefit effect to the citizens in future if they choose Ahok and Djarot pair in the election. The condition that some people dislike his behavior makes him realize that he needs to improve his personality.

5)   Sincerity Condition

Ahok said that he will volunteer himself to change his behavior wholeheartedly. He refers to Djarot as an example, showing that he respect and really want to volunteer himself.

6)   Degree of Strength

The degree of strength of the volunteer is lower than the act of promise. However, it might be high because Ahok shows respect towards his partner, Djarot.

In short, the act of volunteer is classified into commissive speech act. It refers to the speaker's future action about volunteer himself to change his behavior. The utterances said by the speaker purposes to make the hearer to do something, such as choose them in the election. The utterance is considered feliticious because the speaker's utterance contains the six component.

(Data 16) Djarot: *"Oleh karena itu, perjuangan belum selesai, kami ingin lima tahun lagi mengabdi untuk Jakarta.*
"Therefore, our struggle has not finished, we want five more years devoted to Jakarta".

Based on the statement said by the representative of second candidate in datum 16, it shows that they want to volunteer themselves to make a better Jakarta in the next five years. However, there is no performative verb stated. It shows that the utterance has implicit illocution. The programs that previously or now still going on by Ahok, will be continue in the future. The utterance is an indirect speech act, because he did not mean to only make hearer know what their want, but they actually want the hearer to choose them again for the next five years. It is a declarative sentence, because it makes a statement and ends with a period. The second candidate does not ask questions, make commands, or make statements with emotion. The subject in the datum 16 is the first person plural (Kami/We), because Djarot say the word "We" represent himself and Ahok. The action refers to the future act, which will be done by Djarot and Ahok. The indirect object is the second person singular (Jakarta).

Based on Yule's classification of speech act, the utterance spoken by Djarot above is classified into commissive. His words refer to the second

candidate's future action. The speaker commits to people that the first candidate will do something to the hearer by volunteer act.

The felicity condition in the utterance will be analyzed using Vanderveken's theory. It shows whether the speaker's utterance fulfills the six components or not. If it fulfills the six components, then it will be judged felicitious.

1) Illocutionary Point

The point of the utterance is commisive, because Djarot shows that the first candidate commits to devoted to Jakarta. They intend to help Jakarta to get better with their effort for the next five years.

2) Mode of Achievement

Djarot hopes that the citizens can trust them for the next five years. He intends to make the citizen choose them and give them a chance to do another round next term.

3) Propositional Content

The utterance refers to the future act and committed by the speaker (Djarot and his partner, Ahok), means that they will volunteer themselves to do something for the citizens.

4) Preparatory Conditions

The volunteer act must give a benefit effect to the citizens in future if they choose Ahok and Djarot pair in the election.

5) Sincerity Condition

The act of volunteer in the utterance above could be sincere or not, because it is said in a debate, which each candidate also do campaign.

6) Degree of Strength

The degree of strength of the volunteer is greater than the act of offer, but it is lower than the act of promise.

The speaker's utterance is considered feliticious, because it fulfills the six components of felicity condition. The speaker's utterance can achieve the speaker's purpose.

2.2 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 commisive, 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 appraisement.

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 felicitious.

Here is another data analysis.

(Data 10) ANIES: *"Kelak, mereka menjemput anak anaknya dengan perasaan bangga dan bersyukur bahwa pemda Jakarta menyelenggarakan pendidikan yang berkualitas dan tuntas untuk mereka."*

"Later, they will pick up their kids with proud and grateful feelings because the government of Jakarta provides a good quality and complete education for them."

Anies promises to the citizens that he will provide a better education for students in Jakarta. The subject is the first person plural, because the speaker said "They", referring to the parents in Jakarta. The action is being uttered at the time of speaking. In his utterance, there is not an object, but we can conclude that he said to the parents who have children in Jakarta. The utterance purposes to make all parents to feel safe about the education later. Based on Yule's classification of speech act, it is a commissive speech act, because he said something that will happen in the future. A better education in the future for Jakarta is the point of his utterance. He intends to improve the education in Jakarta, for example with a help for the poor to get education in such young age, or maybe he will give many subsidy for students. It is an indirect speech act, because Anies did not convey the intention explicitly. There is no performative verb stated in the utterance. He just said "Later, they will pick up their kids with proud and grateful feelings because the government of Jakarta provides a good quality and complete education for them." The implicit meaning might be he wants whoever would be chosen as the next governor could tremendously focus on the education for every child in Jakarta. So, it would make the parents feel safe and satistied. Type of sentence above is declarative, Anies was just explaining to the hearer about his hopes for Jakarta in the future. It is just a statement.

The theory of illocutionary forces by Vanderveken will judged the act of promise in the utterance in datum 10 felicitously or infelicitously.

1)   Illocutionary Point

The point of the utterance said by Anies is commissive, because he commits to carry out the future action. By saying the utterance, he means that whoever get chosen in the election should more focus on improving the education. He did not say it directly that he will be the one who will accomplish this in the future, but with saying this meaning that he will do that if he is chosen later. The third candidate promises to provide a better education for them.

2)   Mode of Achievement

The third candidate hopes that the hearer, all Jakarta citizens, will feel safe about their children's education. They want all students will get a better quality and complete education. The parents should not worry too much about their kids' education anymore.

3)   Propositional Content

Anies stated that parents will be proud and feel grateful because the governor serves their kids a good education in the future. The utterance refers to the third candidate's future act. Implicitly, he shows to the parents that they will do it as their mission.

4)   Preparatory Condition

The act of promise must give a benefit effect for the hearer. The education will be better and complete for all students, and parent will not worry for it anymore.

5) Sincerity Condition

The speaker looks firm about their future action. The way he said the utterance is clear and sincerely. When saying the utterance, he also put himself as a parent. He looks really care about children's education, because he was also a former education minister.

6) Degree of Strength

The act of a promise is high. Even though Anies said it implicitly, but his words makes the hearer understand what he means and what he promises to do for Jakarta citizens.

In brief, the utterance explained is a commissive speech act, because it refers to act that will be done in future by the speaker. He implicitly promise to make a better and assured education, so that all parent do not need to worry anymore about their children in the future. The speaker's utterance in (data 10) has fulfilled the six components of felicity condition. It is considered felicitious.

Table 4. 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%.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This research is concerned with the illocutionary forces in commisive 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 commisive 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 commisive 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 feliticious. The third candidate's utterances can achieve its purposes to the hearer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Garry; Arsenault, Nancy. 2005. *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. London: Routeledge 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

APPENDIX

Here is the transcript of conversation between each candidate on the first debate of governor election 2017 in Jakarta.

First section, vision and mission section.

Moderator: *"Untuk sesi pertama. Para paslon diminta untuk menjawab pertanyaan yang di lontarkan dalam waktu yang ditentukan utamanya menyangkut visi misi program kerja ungguluan serta intergritas."*

"Dalam waktu dua menit jelaskan visi anda dan misi yang paling utama terkait tema malam ini yaitu pembangunan sosial ekonomi untuk Jakarta jika anda terpilih sebagai gubernur dan wakil gubernur Jakarta. Saya silahkan paslon nomor 1, waktu akan dihitung ketika anda mulai bicara."

"Waktunya silahkan dimulai, waktu akan mengikuti ketika pak agus bicara. Langsung saja."

AHY: *"Assalamualaikum wr wb. Selamat malam dan salam sejahtera untuk kita semua. Warga Jakarta yg saya cintai dan banggakan selain yang sudah baik potret tubuh kualitas hidup masyarakat menurun akibat banjir macet sama jkt banyak yg takut dgn pemerintahnya sendiri."*

"Visi saya 5thn kedepan adalah menjadikan jkt semakin maju aman adil dan sejahtera (Data 1). Untuk dapat mewujudkan itu semua komitmen saya dan tentunya misi saya adalah untuk mengatasi semua permasalahan Jakarta meningkatkan pembangunan sehingga jkt semakin maju kedepan dengan cara meningkatkan ekonomi daerah meningkatkan daya beli masyarakat dan menciptakan lapangan kerja baru (Data 2). Kedua, meningkatkan kualitas pendidikan Pelayanan kesehatan dan juga transportasi umum. Ketiga tentunya meningkatkan kualitas lingkungan hidup dengan cara solusi yang efektif untuk mengatasi problem akut seperti banjir sampah dan polusi dan terakhir yg tidak kalah penting adalah meyakinkan hadirnya rasa aman dan adil untuk seluruh warga Jakarta."*

"Paradigma yang akan kami lakukan adalah Jakarta adalah sebagai system ruang kehidupan yang harus mensejahterakan semua dan juga pembangunan yang inklusif dan partisipatif yang memberdayakan seluruh warga secara adil (Data 3). Dengan paradigma tersebut, *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 (Data 4)."*

AHOK: *"Bagi kami, membangun Jakarta itu visi terutama dan membangun manusianya. Membangun manusia dengan indikator terukur. Kita kenal di dunia dengan indeks pembangunan manusia. Supaya sejajar dengan dunia misal 2015 jakarta telah mencapai ipm 78,99. Artinya kita kurang dari 1,01 telah menyamai tingkat dunia yang tinggi. Nah untuk mencapai visi itu, misi yang paling utama adalah birokrasi harus melayani dengan konsep bersih transparan dan professional karena kami sangat yakin tanpa pejabat publik tanpa birokrasi yang bersih transparan dan professional tidak mungkin program sosial ekonomi atau program apapun bisa kita capai. Maka kami sangat yakin yang paling utama harus di bereskan adalah birokrasi dengan pejabat merekam jejak yang jelas, sudah bersih transparan dan professional."*

"Dan tentu saya juga memaklumin, selama empat tahun lebih ini banyak warga Jakarta hanya melihat penampilan saya. Terlalu menggebu-gebu, terlalu semangat. Akibatnya visi misi yang sudah kami capai program yang sudah terukur, hilang. Sebagian melihat saya terlalu temperamental tapi saya juga bersyukur sebagian orang Jakarta melihat hasil nyata sungai lebih bersih. Semua kelihatan. Pelayanan lebih baik. Terutama, misal saya beri contoh, saya bersyukur punya mas djarot yang melihat apa yang telah saya kerjakan."

"Saya juga belajar terus supaya belajar dari mas djarot namanya juga djarot syaeful hidayat supaya saya agak agak mirip dengan beliau (Data 5). Supaya kalau kami di lanjutkan lagi bukan hanya visi misi program tercapai tapi ahok nya sudah menjadi icore 7 bukan Pentium lagi kalo computer sehingga kami akan lebih baik kesalahpahaman ini akan bisa dihindari (Data 6). Terima kasih."

ANIES: *"Bismillah hirohman nirohim. Assalamualaikum wr wb. Kami hadir di Jakarta membawa pengalaman, pengetahuan dan akumulasi jaringan. **Kami menempatkan Jakarta bukan tempat uji coba (Data 7).** Kami menempatkan Jakarta sebagai tempat untuk kita mengabdi, mengajak maju bersama, dan insya allah tempat berpahala bagi semua. Jakarta warganya berada disini bukan karena ingin punya ktp bertuliskan DKI. Berbagai suku bangsa datang kesini untuk apa untuk merasakan kesejahteraan, keadilan. **Kami hadir berdua untuk memastikan kesejahteraan dan keadilan hadir untuk seluruh warga Jakarta (Data 8). Untuk itu, lapangan pekerjaan menjadi prioritas (Data 9).** Keadilan atas lapangan pekerjaan sangat mendasar. Berikutnya, akses pada pendidikan berkualitas dan tuntas, kita ingin para orang tua bisa mengantarkan anaknya ke sekolah. Bisa mengantarkan anaknya ke madrasah. Dengan perasaan tenang, dengan perasaan yakin dan penuh cinta kasih lalu kita didik anak anak itu sehingga mereka*

menjadi anak anak yang berakhlak anak berkarakter kompeten dan ***kelak mereka menjemput anak anaknya dengan perasaan bangga dan bersyukur bahwa pemda Jakarta menyelenggarakan pendidikan yang berkualitas dan tuntas untuk mereka (Data 10).*** *Yang tidak kalah penting daripada itu, sosial ekonomi kita semua ikhtiar ini menjadi tak bermakna ketika narkoba hadir.* ***Kami akan tegas memerangi narkoba hingga tuntas di kota ini (Data 11). Tidak ada sedikitpun toleransi, karena seluruh ikhtiar kita menjadi tak bermakna begitu hadir narkoba (Data 12).*** *Orang tua sedih, rakyat sedih, karena ancaman narkoba.* ***Kami akan hadirkan kota yang maju, bahagia, aman, damai, dan bebas dari segala macam kriminalitas (Data 13).*** *Terimakasih. Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb.*

Last section

Moderator: *"Jika memang nanti anda yang terpilih untuk menerima amanah selama lima tahun, siapkah anda untuk tidak tergiur tawaran ataupun bujukan maju untuk menjadi capres ataupun cawapres di tahun 2019. Tiga puluh detik untuk menjawab, silahkan paslon ketiga."*

ANIES: *"Ketika kami mendapatkan tugas untuk menjadi calon gubernur di Jakarta, maka ini adalah amanat untuk dituntaskan dan amanat*

dari bapak prabowo dari bapak sohibul iman adalah memimpin Jakarta tuntas lima tahun. Bukan sekedar memimpin barangnya, tapi membangun akhlak karakternya. ***Dan membuat Jakarta bersatu dalam ke bhinekaan. Itu yang menjadi amanat yang akan kita tuntaskan selama lima tahun (Data 14).***"

AHY: *"Kami ada disini untuk berkompetisi, mendapatkan kesempatan. Kesempatan untuk membuktikan bahwa kami bisa memperjuangkan warga Jakarta. Inilah mengapa kita semua hadir disini. Saya pikir sudah jelas kami akan focus untuk strategi memenangkan pilgub dki Jakarta ini. Dan kami ingin sekali didengarkan oleh rakyat bahwa program program yang kami tawarkan benar-benar menjadi solusi bagi masyarakat Jakarta keseluruhan."*

DJAROT: *"Jiwa raga kami, pikiran kami, kami curahkan untuk warga Jakarta. Kami adalah pelayan warga Jakarta. Dengan tulus, kerja kami untuk Jakarta.* ***Kita ingin menjadikan Jakarta suatu ibukota yang bisa di banggakan oleh republik ini, oleh anak negeri ini (Data 15). Oleh karena itu, perjuangan belum selesai, kami ingin lima tahun lagi ngabdi untuk Jakarta (Data 16).***"

Source:

CNN Indonesia Channel on *www. YouTube.com*