

**COMMISSIVE SPEECH ACT IN THE SECOND US
PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE**

THESIS

**BY
NOVIKA NEGRITA SARI
NIM 105110101111017**



**STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
FACULTY OF CULTURAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA
2014**

ABSTRACT

Sari, Novika Negrita. 2014. **Commissive Speech Act in The Second US Presidential Debate**. Study Program of English, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Universitas Brawijaya. Supervisor: Eni Maharsi; Co-supervisor: Didik Hartono.

Keywords: Speech Acts, Commissive Speect Acts Verbs, Direct Speech acts, Indirect Speech, Second US Presidential Debate.

Communicating is one of the fundamental requirements for someone to be able to understand each other. In this study, the writer examined the commissive speech act inherent in the debate between President Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in Second U.S. Presidential Debate edition. There are three problems in this study: (1a) what types of commissive speech act (1b) what are the classifications of commissive speech acts (2) what are the direct and indirect commissive speech act.

This study used a qualitative approach. Research design was text analysis which was applied to analyze the data. The data were the sentences produced by Barack Obama and Mitt Romney in the Second U.S. Presidential Debate. The writer also put the results of the analysis in the table to make it easier to read the results of the analysis.

The results showed there are kinds of commissive acts in the debate. Researchers found 23 conversations that indicate illocutionary acts of commissive. Of these 23, 2 were respectively offers, in which the President or governor speech aim to provide a quote form designs in revolution to the American nation. There were also 4 promises where the debater aimed to give a promise to perform his obligations as a good president for the country. After that, there are 6 refusings in which the speaker tried to give the refusal or denial of the statement that is not true. In addition, there are 6 vowing acts aimed to give oaths so that the listeners can be more confident and believe any major changes which are made to countries such as the U.S. increased the country's economy. Last is 5 volunteering acts which have a goal to not give immediate relief from the president who made volunteering acts without any specific purpose. All these results indicate that the debate contains move indirect sentences that have implied meaning and purposes.

The writer suggests to the next reaserchers conduct a study on speech act focusing on two-way communication among other public figures because there will be more various types of illocutionary act in two-way communication.

ABSTRAK

Sari, Novika Negrita. 2014. Tindak Tutur Komisif Dalam Second US Presidential Debate. Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Universitas Brawijaya. Pembimbing (I) Eni Maharsi, (II) Didik Hartono.

Kata Kunci: Tindak Tutur, Tindak tutur komisif, Tindak tutur langsung, Tindak tutur tidak langsung, Second US Presidential Debate.

Berkomunikasi adalah salah satu kebutuhan mendasar seseorang untuk dapat memahami satu sama lain. Dalam penelitian ini, penulis meneliti tindak tutur komisif yang terdapat di dalam perdebatan antara presiden Barack Obama dan Mitt Romney dalam edisi Second US Presidential Debate. Ada tiga rumusan masalah dalam penelitian ini yaitu (1a) jenis tindak illokusi komisif apa sajakah yang ada (1b) memeriksa lebih luas tindak komisif apa saja (2) penyampaian langsung dan tidak langsung.

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif. Rancangan penelitian digunakan dalam mengaplikasikan bentuk teks untuk menganalisis data. Data diambil dari ungkapan debat oleh Barack Obama dan Mitt Romney dalam Second US Presidential Debate. Penulis juga meletakkan hasil analisis dalam tabel untuk memudahkan membaca hasil analisis.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan terdapat semua jenis tindak komisif di dalam perdebatan. Peneliti menemukan 23 percakapan yang menunjukkan tindak illokusi dari komisif. Dari 23 tersebut masing-masing terdapat 2 penawaran, seperti dalam ujaran Presiden atau gubernur yang memiliki tujuan untuk memberikan penawaran berupa rancangan-rancangan demi menuju perubahan besar negara Amerika. Selain itu juga terdapat 4 berjanji dimana para pembicara berjanji untuk melakukan kewajibannya sebagai Presiden yang baik untuk negaranya. Setelah itu, terdapat 6 penolakan di mana pembicara berusaha untuk memberikan bantahan atau penolakan terhadap ungkapan yang tidak benar. Selain itu, terdapat 6 pernyataan sumpah yang bertujuan untuk memberikan sumpah agar para pendengar lebih yakin dan percaya adanya perubahan besar yang dilakukan untuk negara Amerika seperti meningkatnya perekonomian negara. Terakhir adalah 5 bantuan atau pengungkapan suka rela yang memiliki tujuan untuk memberikan bantuan langsung dari Presiden tanpa ada maksud tertentu. Dari semua hasil tersebut menunjukkan bahwa dalam debat lebih banyak menggunakan kalimat tidak langsung yang memiliki makna dan tujuan tersirat.

Penulis menyarankan kepada peneliti selanjutnya untuk mencari subyek penelitian yang didalamnya melibatkan dua orang. Serta mencari bahan yang akan diteliti lebih dari satu dan menggunakan teori lain untuk meneliti agar mendapatkan hasil yang berbeda.

REFERENCES

- Ariff, Tun Nur A. Z. & Mugableh, Ahmad Ibrahim (2013) *Speech Act of Promising among Jordanians*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. University of Malaysia (USIM). Retrieved July, 2014, from http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_13_July_2013/29.pdf
- Austin, J.L.(1969).*Performative Constantive, an Essay in the Philosophy ofLanguage*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, J.L.(1962). *How to Do Things with Words*: Oxford At he clarendon press.
- Complete Second Presidential Town Hall DebateBarack Obama vs. Mitt Romney*(2012). Retrieved on October, 16 2012, from <http://youtu.be/QEpCrcMF5Ps>
- Creswell, Jhon W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design coosing among five traditions*. California: SAGE publications.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. USA, Canada: Routledge.
- Grundy, Peter. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Horecky, J.(2007). The Cintent and Form of Illocutionary Acts. *Journal ofTheoretical Linguistics*, 63-68. Retrieved from http://www.pulib.sk/skase/Volumes/JTL08/pdf_doc/11.pdf.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London. Longman Ltd
- Levinson, Steven C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press
- Merriam, Webster. (1990). *The Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield: Merriam-Webster Incorporation.
- Moon Kyunghye. *Speech Act Study: Differences Between Native and Nonnative Speaker Complaint Strategies*. The American University.
- Oxford University. (2003). *Oxford Advancers Learner's dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- Partana, Paina. 2004. "Tindak Tutur Komisif Bahasa Jawa", (Laporan Penelitian DIKS TA 2004). Surakarta: Fakultas Sastra dan Seni Rupa, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta.

- Searle, J.R. (1969). *What is A Speech Act, An Essay in the Philosophy OfLanguage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Ulfa, Vinda maretha. (2010). *A Study With Speech Acts in the Main Character's Utterances Containing Conflicts in Slamdog Millionaire Movie*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang. University of Brawijaya
- Wierzcicka, A. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs: Semantic Dictionary*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wijana, I.D.P.(1996). *Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta : Penerbit andi
- Wijayanti (2005). *Speech Act used by Street Boys at Flamboyan Housing in Malang*. Malang: Brawijaya University.
- Yule, G.(1996) *Pragmatics*. USA : Oxford University Press