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ABSTRACT

This study is aimed at 2 objectives: (1) the intention of commissive utterance in the republican debate in Miami on March 10, 2016 and (2) the implied meaning of the commissive utterance in the republican debate in Miami on March 10, 2016. The data of this reserach are utterance containing commissive intens. The writer used observation and documentation as the technique of collecting data in thus study. The data are analyzed by using speech act theory of Kreidler (1998) and context situation theory of Brown and Yule (1983)

This study shows that there are four kinds of commissive utterance, They are promising, pledging, threatening and vowing. The four commissive utterances are ranked into the most dominant, promising, the second dominant, threatening and vowing, the third dominant, vowing. This research also describe the implied meaning which have different important role to understand the meaning of the utterance.

Keyword: commissive utterance, context situation

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning or contextual meaning. One of the main studies in pragmatics concerns how people understand utterances. According to Levinson (1983: 21) pragmatic is the study of the relations
between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. Based on the definition, it can be seen that in understanding the language the people should not only know the meaning of the utterance but also the context around the utterance occurred. In communication, they speak anything, like they asks someone to do something, gives information, gives compliment. They also promises. Speaker utters words that make hearer to do something or not to do something in the future. Beside that, there is a moment when the hearer does not believe in the speaker’s words. Then, the speaker commits his/herself to make hearer believe in the speaker’s words. Therefore, people use commissive utterances in their conversation to show their acts in the future.

According to Kreidler (1998: 192), commissive is utterances that commit a speaker to a course of action. These include promises, pledges, threats, vows, etc. Commisive verbs are illustrated by agree, ask, offer, refuse, swear, all with following infinitive. They are prospective and concerned with the speaker’s commitment to the future action, for example, *I promise*. In the speaker’s utterance also has implied meaning. Implied meaning is what is implied from the context according Brown and Yule (1983: 35).

Commissive utterance is interesting to be studied because it often used in the daily life’s conversation. So we can know what the meaning or implication from the promises. This study focuses on the intentions, implicatures and the maxims violation of commissive utterance. The researcher intends to analyze commissive utterance in the debate, where the people can give argumentation or opinion to discuss something. In this research, the researcher chooses the Republican debate where the candidates give some promises to make sure the audience or the citizen to support and choose them.

There are some previous study which have been conducted by other researcher. First, Historiana (2016) presented research to find the intention of commissive utterances in the translation of *Chapter Ash-Shu’ara*. The data of
this study are verses of Chapter Ash-Shu’ara containing commissive utterances. The result of the research showed that five kinds of the intention of commissive utterances in the English translation Chapter Ash-Shu’ara based on Searle’ classification. There are promising, threatening, refusing, vowing and volunteering. The researcher found 8 verses of promising (24%), 8 verses of threatening (24%), 6 verses of refusing (18%), 2 verses of vowing (7%), 5 verses of volunteering (15%) and 4 verses of challenging (12%). The majority of the intention of commissive utterances that the researcher found in English translation of Chapter Ash-Shu’ara is promising and threatening (24%).

Second, Al-Bantany (2013) described the use of commissive speech acts in the Banten gubernatorial candidate debate and the realization of politeness in the use of the speech acts. Data were collected by downloading the debate from relevant websites. The data analysis was based on Searle’s (1979) classification of speech acts and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness. It is found that commissive speech acts were mostly realized through guarantee (53.7%), followed by promise (38.9%), and refusal (7.4%). It is also found that in terms of politeness, all the candidates appear to behave in relatively the same way.

The benefits of this study consist of theoretical benefit and practical benefit. In theoretical benefit, the result of this study can enrich knowledge about commissive utterance. In practical benefit, This study can give more knowledges about how to analyze commissive utterance by referring to contextual meaning for the students. This study also can be reference for lecturer in transferring knowledge to their students specifically about commissive utterance and make the example of commissive utterance through this transcript of republican debate, and for other researchers, the result of this research can be meaningful for them especially whose topic is similar with this research.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The type of the research is descriptive qualitative. Descriptive qualitative is applied to solve the problem by collecting, classifying, analyzing, and describing a certain situation objectively. It is qualitative research because the
researcher analyzed the data in the form of utterances. The researcher used descriptive method because he analyzed the data and then described the finding to answer the research question. The data of this study is commissive utterances found in transcript of republican debate in Miami on March 10,2016.

In collecting data, the researcher uses documentation and observation to collect the data then coding the commissive utterances based on the variation of commissive utterances.

3. RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

From the data analysis, the researcher gets 22 data of commissive utterances containing, there are 4 types of commissive utterances; promise, pledge, threat and vow and the implied meaning of commissive utterance, as follows:

3.1 Intention of Commissive Utterance

3.1.1 Direct Illocution

007/ TRDM/ JK/ Promising

“I don't - I haven't seen the provisions of that bill, Jake. My initial instincts are no. And let me just say about the V.A. When a veteran comes home, they ought to have access to healthcare wherever they want to go at any time, number one.

Number two, the Veterans Administration needs to be restructured. It needs to be downsized and spread out. It needs to be so responsive to the needs of the veterans.

And secondly, the Pentagon needs to share the information of returning veterans with the veterans' service operations in the states and with the job people in the states so that when a veteran comes home, they can be linked with a job.

And when that happens, that means that every veteran will get work, because they're our golden employees. No veteran ought to be without healthcare; no veteran ought to be homeless; and no veteran ought to be unemployed in the United States of America.”

In the dialogue, Kasich answers the tapper’s question about the veteran. Kasich haven’t seen the provisions that veterans’ benefit are be part of attemps to reduce the difficult. The Veterans Administration needs to be restructured. It needs to be downsized and spread out. It
needs to be so responsive to the needs of the veterans. He said that every veteran would get work because they’re the golden employees.

**The locution** of the utterance above is that Kasich has told to Tapper that every veteran will get work. **The illocution** of Kasich’s utterance is that he promises to the veteran that they will get work because they are the golden employees. So, Kasich’s commissive utterance is classified as a **Promising**.

### 3.2.2 Indirect Illocution

**002/ TRDM/ TC/ Promising**

“And as president, what I will do for seniors, for anyone at or near retirement, **there will be no changes whatsoever. Every benefit will be protected to the letter.** But for younger workers, we need to change the rate of growth of benefits so it matches inflation instead of exceeding inflation. And as you noted Dinan, we need to have for younger workers, that a portion of your tax payments are in personal accounts, like the 401(k), that you own, that you control, that you can pass on to your kids and grandkids.”

In the dialogue, Cruz answers Dinan’s question about younger workers who put some of their social security taxes into personal accounts. He said that need to change the rate of growth of benefits so it matches inflation instead of exceeding inflation.

**The locution** of the utterance above is that Cruz has told to Dinan that there will be no changes whatsoever. Every benefit will be protected to the letter. **The illocution** of Cruz utterance is that he promises to younger and senior worker that they will have benefit about their social security taxes. Cruz’s intention is to make the senior, the people who at or near retirement do not worry about their social security taxes. So, Cruz’s commissive utterance is classified as a **Promising**.
3.2 Implied Meaning of Commissive Utterance

002/TRDM/JK/Treatening

Dinan: Governor Kasich, I want to come to you next. Mr. Trump says that legal immigration is producing quote, "lower wages and higher unemployment for U.S. workers". He's calling for a pause on green cards issued to foreign workers. Wouldn't that help workers in the U.S.?

Kasich: Well look, I believe in immigration, but it has to be controlled. The simple fact of the matter is I wouldn't be standing here. I'd be maybe running for president of Croatia if we didn't have immigration.

The participants of the dialogue are Dinan and Kasich. Dinan gives question which is needed to be response by Kasich. Dinan said that a pause green card will help workers in the U.S or not. Kasich’s utterance implies that Kasich does not agree with Trump quote because immigration is very important for America.

These are the summaries from types of commissive utterance.

Types of commissive utterance found in the transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type of Commissive Utterance</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>I will stand up and I will shut down those imports because they're a violation of the agreement we have and the American worker expects us to stand up</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pledging</td>
<td>We are going to have to work together with other - with Muslims, who do not - who are not radicals. We're going to have to work with the Jordanian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will find them and I will fire them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vowing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We'll build our factories here and we'll make our own products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above the types of commissive utterance found in transcript of Rebuplican debate in Miami consist of promising, pledging, threatening and vowing. As listed on the table 4.1 above there are 15 promising (68%), 1 pledging (4%), 3 threatening (14%) and 3 vowing (14%). The majority of types of commissive utterance used by the candidates in the Republican debate in Miami is promising.

4. CLOSING

After analyzing the commissive utterances, the researcher concludes that the candidates in republican debate in Miami on March 10,2016 uses various types of commissive utterances there are 22 commissive utterances consist of promise, pledge, threat and vow . The majority types of commissive utterances used promise. The researcher also found the meaning of the candidate’s utterance. Some hearers can understand the intended meaning of the speakers, but some are not. The hearer that fails to understand the context gets confused, angry and displeased. It is expected that this analysis will help people to understand a meaning of the utterance by other people in a real conversation.
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