

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Background of the Study

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. Commissive 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. The Republican debate was held in Miami on March 10, 2016. The location is in University of Miami in Miami, Florida. The moderator is Jake Tapper and the candidates are Real estate developer and businessman Donald Trump, Ohio Governor John Kasich, Senator Ted Cruz of Texas, and Senator Marco Rubio of Florida. There the moderatore gave some questions for the candidates. In that debate, the Republican candidates say their promising to make America better.

Based on the phenomena above, it is very significant for the candidates promise about what they will do to America. The writer is interested in conducting research entitled. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Commissive Utterance Used in Republican Debate in Miami on March 10, 2016.*

## **B. Limitation of the Study**

In this research paper, the writer only focuses on pragmatics, especially commissive utterance in republican debate in Miami on March 10, 2016. This reserach uses the theory from Kreidler (1998: 192) that include promises, pledges, threats, vows, etc. Commissive verbs are illustrated by agree, offer, refuse, swear, all with following infinitive. They are prospective and concerned with the speaker's commitment to the future action.

## **C. Problem Statement**

The following are the research problem formulated by the writer.

1. What are the intentions of commissive utterance used in the republican debate in Miami on March 10, 2016?

2. What are the implied meaning of commissive utterance in the republican debate in Miami on March 10, 2016?

#### **D. Objective of the Study**

Based on the research problems, the objective of this research are as follows.

1. To describe the intentions of the commissive utterances in the republican debate in Miami on March 10, 2016.
2. To describe the implied meaning of the commissive utterances in the republican debate in Miami on March 10, 2016.

#### **E. Benefit of the Study**

The writer hope the result of this research can give more benefits either theoretically or practically.

1. Theoretical benefits

The writer hopes the result of this research will enrich knowledge about commissive utterance.

2. Practical Benefit

- a. Students

The writer wishes the result of this research can give more knowledges about how to analyze commissive utterance by referring to contextual meaning.

- b. Lecturers

The writer hopes the result of this research can be a reference in transferring knowledge to their students specifically about commissive utterance and make the example of commissive utterance through this transcript of republican debate.

- c. Other researchers

The writer hopes the result of this research can be meaningful for them especially whose topic is similar with this research.