

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Language is very important for people. Every person can use language for doing something, such as giving talk and providing information to others. When someone communicates with others, the meaning of the word should be appropriate with the context. The concepts of the meaning and words are included in the study of pragmatics. Yule (1996, p. 4) states that pragmatics is the study of meaning in context. Pragmatics focused on the interpretation of linguistics in context.

There are many theories in pragmatics. One of the theories in pragmatics is commissive illocutionary acts. Kreidler (1998, p. 192) says that commissive illocutionary act refers to utterances used to commit a speaker to doing some action. Sometimes, people use the words to do some future actions. For example, speakers use the words that make the hearer to do something in the future. Then, the speaker commits to the hearer that can make the hearer believe the speaker's word. In this case, the speaker uses commissive illocutionary acts by words. According to Searle (1976), there are six types of commissive illocutionary acts: promise, guarantee, refusal, threat, offer, and volunteer.

In this study, the writer is interested in analyzing the type of commissive illocutionary act; those are promise, guarantee, refusal, threat, offer, volunteer and also the function of commissive illocutionary act; to get sympathy or confidence,

to refuse something, to give intimidation, and to help or give something that used in the data. There are phenomena of commissive illocutionary act found in the presidential speech.

For example:

1. Clinton: Obviously, I'm hoping to earn your vote, I'm hoping to be elected in November, **and I can promise you, I will work with every American.**
2. Trump: **No, I'm a gentlemen, Hillary. Go ahead.**

The first example "and I can promise you, I will work with every American" is a commissive illocutionary act indicating a promise. The speaker (Clinton) promises that she will work with every American. This utterance is a promise because there is an intention which gives benefit to the hearer. Thus, it has a function to get sympathy or confidence from the hearer.

The second example "No, I'm a gentlemen, Hillary. Go ahead" is a commissive illocutionary act indicating a refusal. The speaker (Trump) refuses to start or give response from the question of audience. This example is a refusal because there is a refusal from the speaker to the hearer. It has a function to refuse something.

There are many phenomena of language which contain commissive illocutionary act, such as novel, short story, movie and etc. In daily conversation, commissive illocutionary act is interest because it can help people when explaining purpose or interrogating someone. So, commissive illocutionary act is appropriate with debate. In this study, the writer chooses the political speech *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump* because

their speech about their action in the future if they are selected. The data is interesting because there are many different opinions between Hillary and Trump. Beside that, some of data containing refusal. The reason why the writer chooses commissive illocutionary act as the focus because while doing a debate, every candidate does campaign explaining about their vision and mission. It is related to their action in the future.

There are some related studies that are conducted by other writers. The studies are conducted by Tun Nur Afizah Zainal Ariff (2013) and Nabilah Fairuz Al-Bantany (2013). Both of them discuss about the type of commissive illocutionary act by using Austin and Searle as the main theory. Not yet of them concern with the function of commissive illocutionary act and Doanald Trump and Hillary Clinton's political speech.

Based on explanation above, the aim of the study to explain the type and the function of commissive illocutionary act in the political speech *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump* that include promise, guarantee, refusal, threat, offer, volunteer and the function: to get sympathy or confidence, to refuse something, to give intimidation, and to help or give something.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problems

This study intends to analyze how the theory of commissive illocutionary act applied in *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump*. The question can be addressed as follows:

1. What are the types of commissive illocutionary act in the political speech *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump*?
2. What are the functions of commissive illocutionary act in the political speech *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump*?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the research problem above, this study wants to achieve some objectives to answer the research questions. Those are such as follows:

1. To explain the type of commissive illocutionary act found in the political speech *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump*.
2. To explain the function of commissive illocutionary act in the political speech *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump*.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Theoretically, this study can help the readers to know about the theory of commissive illocutionary act.

Practically, this study can give an additional reference for readers to support the theory of commissive illocutionary act in pragmatics especially for the linguistic students at University of Trunojoyo Madura.

1.5 Scope and Limitation

The scope of this study is in the field of pragmatics focus on the theory of speech act. It is concerned with the theory of commissive illocutionary act that includes promise, guarantee, refusal, threat, volunteer and offer. The writer analyze the political speech uses to analyze the theory of commissive illocutionary act in the political speech.

The limitation of this study is on utterances in the political speech *The Second Presidential Debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump*.