

## UTTERANCES IN THE 2017 JAKARTA GUBERNATORIAL DEBATE OF REGIONAL ELECTION

Dewi Nuryanti  
Institut Bisnis Nusantara  
[deaprodhite@gmail.com](mailto:deaprodhite@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe the functions of various utterances uttered by the candidates during the debate for the Jakarta Gubernatorial election. The study utilized a descriptive qualitative research approach, specifically focusing on describing spoken utterances. The theoretical framework applied was the theory of speech acts by Austin and Searle. Data were sourced from the Jakarta Gubernatorial debate during the regional election and downloaded from <https://www.youtube.com/>. The analysis revealed that the candidates used their utterances to inform the public about certain conditions in Jakarta using declarative utterances. They aimed to express their beliefs on various matters, hoping to influence their voters to share the same perspectives. The candidates predicted that they would transform Jakarta into a more modern and secure city, bringing prosperity within the next five years. They also expressed gratitude for favourable conditions while sometimes offering criticisms or complaints. Additionally, they highlighted positive attributes of others, showcasing mutual praise. Their utterances were intended to persuade or call upon the audience to take certain actions and commit to fighting against drug issues in Jakarta.

**Keywords:** Election, Gubernatorial debate, Speech Acts, Regional Election, Utterances

### ABSTRAK

*Tujuan dari studi ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan dan memahami fungsi dari berbagai ucapan yang diucapkan oleh para kandidat selama debat Pemilihan Gubernur DKI Jakarta. Studi ini menggunakan pendekatan penelitian kualitatif deskriptif, khususnya memfokuskan pada deskripsi ucapan yang diucapkan secara lisan. Kerangka teoretis yang digunakan adalah teori tindak tutur oleh Austin dan Searle. Data diambil dari debat Pemilihan Gubernur DKI Jakarta selama pemilihan daerah dan diunduh dari <https://www.youtube.com/>. Hasil analisis mengungkapkan bahwa para kandidat menggunakan ucapan mereka untuk memberi tahu publik tentang kondisi tertentu di Jakarta dengan menggunakan ucapan deklaratif. Mereka bertujuan untuk menyampaikan keyakinan mereka tentang berbagai hal, berharap dapat mempengaruhi pemilih mereka untuk memiliki pandangan yang sama. Para kandidat memprediksi bahwa mereka akan mengubah Jakarta menjadi kota yang lebih modern dan aman, membawa kemakmuran dalam lima tahun mendatang. Mereka juga mengungkapkan rasa terima kasih atas kondisi yang menguntungkan, sambil kadang-kadang memberikan kritik atau keluhan. Selain itu, mereka menyoroti atribut positif dari orang lain, menunjukkan pujian saling-menyelamati. Ucapan mereka dimaksudkan untuk membujuk atau memanggil audiens untuk melakukan tindakan tertentu dan berkomitmen untuk melawan masalah narkoba di Jakarta.*

*Kata Kunci: Debat Calon Gubernur, Pemilihan, Tindak Tutur, Pemilihan Daerah, Ujaran*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Every place in Indonesia will have different time in doing the regional election. The election is about to choose the next leader who will lead one province. Since 2015, the regional election was done at the

same day around Indonesia, except for DKI Jakarta Province. As the capital city of Indonesia, the regional election for the Governor of DKI Jakarta has become an interesting thing to be followed by not only for Jakarta's people, but also for the whole Indonesia citizen. To be the leader of DKI Jakarta is not an easy thing as well as its difficult way since its status as the capital city of Indonesia.

In its progress of the election, the parties will choose their best candidates to pursue the way to be Jakarta 'first man'. From years, there will always appear more than one candidate in Jakarta election for the Governor position. Therefore, the candidates must promote themselves to their voter. The candidates have to tell their supporters that they are the right one for governing Jakarta. Since Indonesia has run the direct election, either for general or regional election, the rule for the campaign also has changed. Nowadays, there is one rule for the candidate to grab their voters' attention in a public space which differ from the previous time, that is by doing a public debate.

The debate is the way to exchange different argument, defend the argument, or exchange opinions by two persons or groups that have different views. The debate goal is to defend each opinion and/or arguments and beat each opponent through different programs. The goal to do the debate is to show whose candidates are the best one.

In a Democratic country, to have the candidates debated is the best way to show the voter the best candidates that they have in order to win the election. Doing the debate is the way for some candidates to tell the voters that they do not get any mistakes in choosing their future leader. In its way to the Election Day, the General Election Committee (or stands for KPU) has arranged several times debate during the campaign period. At first round, there were three candidates which the writers named them as Candidate A (Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono-Sylviana Murni); Candidate B (Basuki Tjahaja Purnama-Djarot Saiful Hidayat); and Candidate C (Anies Baswedan-Sandiaga Salahuddin Uno). The writer will focus on the utterances uttered by all Candidates in her research.

Debating is a formal way to argue different opinions between two parties. It usually occurs in different field and interest, whether in a politic or in Students presidential vote, debating is the best way to show one vision, mission, future programs, and plannings. During the debate, the candidates will try to get their voters' attention by showing each opinion through language. Each candidate will utter different utterances with its different meanings and purpose. So that, through debating people get comprehends about the candidates' purpose from their utterances.

By debating, all candidates will tell all audiences about their programs, whether audiences in the debate's place or they are who watch the debate from television around Indonesia. The audiences or the viewers will know whether the candidates promise to give a good thing, to tell audiences that they have done good works, or to criticize others. Because of that, this research will describe about utterances uttered by all candidates during the debate. During the debate, there are many utterances uttered by all

candidates. The utterances may inform some information, or give some promises to the voter. Here, the writer only wants to know what function of uttering different utterances by the candidates during the debate of DKI Jakarta's Governor election. This reserach only focuses on finding the different functions of uttering different utterances in the debate by the candidates in the debate of Jakarta's Governor election.

People use language to reach different purpose by using different way of speaking. When they have to share story in written, it can be easily understood by the reader from the written sentences. In other hands, the same story can also be shared by using language orally and by face-to-face speaking. By this way, both speaker and hearer directly comprehend each other and cause the conversation run smoothly. The spoken information then can also be created in written form and known as utterance.

### **Utterance**

In speaking, utterances are the important part of humans' language and communication. Each utterance will tell the hearer that there is a different intention in each speaker's utterances. An utterance is an act of speech or writing; it is a specific event, a particular time and place and involving at least one person, the one who produces the utterance, but usually more than one person (Kreidler, 1998:26). Therefore, in utterance, specific speech events may clearly tell the hearer about the intentions itself.

An utterance is often part of a larger discourse - a conversation, a formal lecture, a poem, or a business letter. It also occurs in conversation to have self defends from the opponents, which is in debate. In addition, Kreidler (1998) also states that actual utterances can have various functions that are independent of form (176). In conversation, the utterances can occur to ask question without truly seeking information, or to produce command that is not meant to elicit action from addressee.

An utterance uttered by a speaker refers to the uttering of a speech act. Therefore, written utterances usually use the quotation marks to indicate its differences from sentences. The speech act usually occurs as the real form of using language and doing an action. Using speech acts in a conversation shows individual ability of using language in a specific context. That is why the focus of the use of speech acts is usually to the meaning or speakers' intentions.

### **Speech Act**

Speech act has various forms in order to show different meanings. As Austin (1962) defined that basically, when a speaker uttered something, he/she did something through the language. By using language, the speaker does not only inform something (that might be information) but also acts as what the language says.

Furthermore, Yule (1996) also defined speech act as an action done through an utterance. So, when someone says “I close the door” while he/she also in action of closing the door. In speech act, the utterance may have different purposes to reach one goal in speaking.

Yule then added that on any occasion, the action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts (48). There is first dimension known as a locutionary act, which is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression. As seen in the following example (1) “I’ve just made some coffee”. Mostly we do not just produce well-formed utterances with no purpose. By the above example, we know that the speaker is only uttering the utterance which the addressee understands its meaning clearly.

The second dimension occurs when we form an utterance with some kind of functions in mind, or the illocutionary act. The illocutionary act is performed via the communicative force of an utterance. We might utter (1) in the purpose to make statement, an offer, an explanation, or for some other communicative purpose. This is also generally known as the illocutionary force of the utterance. The example 1 can be understood by someone that the speaker offers him/her a cup of coffee. Otherwise, the speaker may tell other something he has done.

When a speaker utters an utterance, s/he does not simply create an utterance with a function without intending it to have effect. This is the third dimension, or perlocutionary act. From the utterance (1) above, its assumption might cause the hearer recognizes the effect intended (to account for a wonderful smell, or to get the hearer to drink some coffee, or to ask someone to visit). This is also known as perlocutionary effect.

In its development, the speech act theory by Austin was the most popular among the pragmatists. The speech act theory occurs as the reaction to the view about declarative utterances which describes state of affairs does not describe something and cannot be said as true or not. Austin has divided speech act into two basic rules: 1) as constative and 2) performative.

The constative utterance is an utterance which draws a factual condition, relate to a factual thing or the historical event in the past. This utterance has its consequences to define whether something is right or wrong by based on its factual relations between the speaker and the real fact. At the end, it can be seen that the dimension of constative utterance is right-wrong.

Constative utterance is an utterance which do not do an action and can be seen it right-wrong easily. Differ to constative utterance, the performative utterances imply the speaker’s action. The performative utterance cannot be defined its right-wrong based on its fact. Here, in the performative utterance the speaker does not only utters an utterance but also perform an action. It can be seen from the candidates’ utterances. Each utterance performs different function.

Related to the function of uttering an utterance, Searle (1981) classified five general functions performed by using speech acts. He said that when a speaker says something, he wants his hearer know that the speaking is intended to fill the function as:

1. Declarative: speech acts that change the world via their utterances. As seen in the following example (2) when a priest says “I now pronounce you husband and wife”, the Priest has caused a change of the man or the woman’s life from being a single into a married one; or in (3) when a soccer player is punished by the referee using utterance “You’re out!”. The player cannot play and be at the soccer field anymore and should be out of the field because of the referee’s utterance.

By using declarative utterances, the speaker changes the world via words. In declarative utterances, the speaker has to have a special institutional role and in a specific context in order to perform a declaration appropriately. From the examples above, the world of two single human beings will not be changed if the ceremony is not led by the Priest; or the soccer player will be played if he is not expelled by the referee.

2. Representative: speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Statements of fact, assertions, conclusions, and descriptions. By using representative utterance, the speaker makes words fit the world (of belief). It can be seen from the following utterances (4) “The earth is flat”. By uttering the statement, the speaker shows his/her belief of the fact that the earth is not in other shape. The speaker wants his/her addressee to have shared belief as hers/his about something through his/her utterance.
3. Expressive: speech acts that state what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. The utterances are uttered because the speaker does something and have experiences or the hearer does something. As seen from the utterance (5) “Congratulations!” is uttered by a speaker to his/her hearer because of doing something or achieve something; or in (6) “I’m really sorry!” is uttered by a speaker to show his/her feeling toward a specific situation. In using expressive utterances, the speaker makes words fit the world (of feeling).
4. Directive: speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. The utterances are commands, orders, requests, suggestions, and they can be positive or negative. In using directive utterances, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words (via the hearer). It can be seen in the utterances in (7) “Don’t touch that”. By uttering the utterance “Don’t touch that”, the speaker wants the hearer not to touch the object pointed by the speaker. It is negative directive utterance which avoid the hearer to do something.

5. Commissive: speech acts that speaker use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. They are promises, threats, refusals, pledges, and can be performed by the speaker alone, or by the speaker as a member of a group. In using commissive utterances, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words (via the speaker). It can be seen in the utterances (8) "I'm going to get it right next time", the speaker promises something to the hearer that through his/her utterance s/he will do some actions in other time in future. By promising through the utterance, the addressee knows that a speaker will not do the action at the moment of speaking.

Analysis about using different utterances, especially that ones relate to the use of speech acts is not new, such as by Jagero (2012) who analyses a CDA used by politicians; Ilie (2003); Rosyidi, et al (2019) who analysed debate in Presidential debate; or by Al-Bantany, N. F. (2013) who took data from Banten Gubernatorial candidate debate. The data used by the previous researchers are vary from political to different articles.

## **II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In doing the research, the writer needs the guidance to help her to do the research well. So that, she has to do her research based on method and technique which explained by experts. Here, she will explain more about some important ways of doing her research that include the information about data.

The method used in this research is a descriptive qualitative method. This method will use data as it occurs as the factual data using language and without any numbers. Therefore, statistical analysis will not be needed in the analysis procedure. As Moleong (2007:6) explained that qualitative research is research, which has result of analysis procedure without using statistic analytical procedure.

Furthermore, Cresswell (2014:4) and (Nuryanti, 2019) added that the process of research involves emerging questions and procedures, data typically collected in the participant's setting, data analysis inductively building from particulars to general themes, and the researcher making interpretations of the meaning of the data.

Data were taken from the DKI Jakarta's Governor candidate during the debate of the regional election. The writer took one segment for her data because of time limitation. She watched the debate then recognized some phenomena of speaking during the debate. After watching the debate, the writer downloaded the video of the debate from <https://www.youtube.com/>. She watched the debate many times to try to recognize some utterances she needed. She also tried to transcribe the whole utterances she

listened to through the video. After getting all utterances, the writers tried to recheck whether the transcribed utterances were similar to the utterances in the video. Due to the length of the debate which has six segments, the writer only takes one segment for the sample of data.

During the collecting the data, the writer did the observation technique. She observed and written down some utterances which related to the types of different utterances as well as its purposes of using those utterances in debate. Data was grouped into its types which based on Searle's theory.

In the process of research, some techniques will be conducted. The writer will let the respondents to have conversation among them. During this conversation, the writer records the conversation. There will be one recording, which will be chosen among others and will be used as the data. The recording process is aimed to get all expression.

In the process of collecting the data, the writer does not change or modify the conversation. So that, the writer lets the data occur as natural as they are. The data then are transcribed into written form. After transcribing the data, the writer groups the data into different lists of data based on the questions. After that, data are going to analyze.

In analyzing data, the writer uses different theories. She uses theories, which are related to the questions asked. She will not use other theories to analyze data since it will not be needed. Not all data analysis will be shown here for they are assumed to have the same results.

### III. DISCUSSION

No	Types of utterances	Examples of the utterances	Markers
1.	Declarative: a. To state	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>"Paradigma yang akan kami lakukan adalah Jakarta sebagai sebuah sistem ruang kehidupan ... memberdayakan seluruh warga secara adil"</i></li> <li>2. <i>"Kami menempatkan Jakarta bukan sebagai tempat uji coba"</i>.</li> <li>3. <i>"Keadilan atas lapangan pekerjaan sangat mendasar"</i>.</li> </ol>	<p>... sebuah sistem ruang kehidupan ...</p> <p>... bukan sebagai tempat uji coba</p> <p>Keadilan atas lapangan ...</p>
2.	Representative: a. Believe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>"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"</i></li> <li>2. <i>"Makanya kami sangat yakin, yang paling utama yang harus dibereskan adalah birokrasi dengan pejabat dengan rekam jejak yang jelas, sudah bersih, transparan, professional"</i>.</li> </ol>	<p>Karena kami sangat yakin ...</p> <p>... kami sangat yakin,...</p>

	b. To claim	1. <i>"Kami hadir di Jakarta membawa pengalaman, pengetahuan, dan akumulasi jaringan"</i> .	... membawa pengalaman, pengetahuan,
	c. To Predict	1. <i>"Visi saya lima tahun ke depan adalah menjadikan Jakarta semakin maju, aman, adil, dan sejahtera"</i> .	... lima tahun ke depan ...
3.	Expressive: a. To grateful	1. <i>"Tapi saya bersyukur sebagian orang Jakarta melihat hasil nyata, sungai lebih bersih, semua kelihatan, pelayanan lebih baik"</i> .	... saya bersyukur ...
	b. To Criticize	1. <i>"Selain yang sudah baik, potret Jakarta hari ini, ketimpangan meningkat, daya beli sebagian masyarakat menurun. Di samping itu kualitas hidup masyarakat menurun akibat banjir, macet, sampah yang tidak bisa terselesaikan dengan baik. Dan yang paling menyedihkan adalah, di sana-sini warga Jakarta banyak yang takut terhadap pemerintahnya sendiri"</i> .	... ketimpangan meningkat ..., dan yang paling menyedihkan, ...
	c. To Praise	1. <i>"Saya mendapat kehormatan bersama-sama Mas Anies dalam kurun waktu 12 bulan terakhir berkeliling menjelajah ke 44 kecamatan, 267 kelurahan di wilayah Jakarta"</i> .	... mendapat kehormatan ...
4.	Directive: a. To command	1. <i>"Nah untuk mencapai visi itu, misi yang utama adalah birokrasi harus melayani dengan konsep bersih, transparan, dan professional"</i> .	... harus melayani ...
	b. To persuade	1. <i>"Lalu kita didik anak-anak itu sehingga menjadi anak-anak yang berakhlak, anak yang berkarakter, anak yang berkompeten"</i> .	... kita didik anak-anak ...
	c. To call for	1. <i>"Posisi kita tegas. Kita menolak reklamasi. Karena ini adalah contoh bagaimana kita akan menyaksikan sebuah tempat yang nanti akan menjadi enclave"</i> .	... kita menolak (pemimpin dan masyarakat)
5.	Commissive: a. To promise	1. <i>"Kami akan tegas memerangi narkoba hingga tuntas di kota ini"</i> .	Kami akan tegas ...
	b. Commit	1. <i>"Dengan paradigma tersebut, saya akan berdiri yang terdepan bersama warga Jakarta untuk mengubah warga ibukota menjadi semakin modern, unggul, tetapi tetap menjadi kota yang manusiawi ..."</i>	... saya akan berdiri yang terdepan ...

**Table 1. Utterances in debate segment one**

The above table shows some examples of the utterances consist of different speech acts from the debate. Based on the utterances uttered by all candidates, people will understand the programs they offer. In the following part, the writer will give samples of analysis of the above data.



Speech act from the debate:

1. Declarative utterances. These utterances occur in order to tell or to state to audiences about some condition in Jakarta. The utterances are statements to make the audiences realize about different situation in Jakarta. In the debate, the candidates declare different situation about Jakarta by their utterances. The utterances uttered by the candidates are:
  - a. *“Paradigma yang akan kami lakukan adalah Jakarta sebagai sebuah sistem ruang kehidupan ... memberdayakan seluruh warga secara adil”*. In this utterance, the candidate states that Jakarta is not only a place to live in but also as a “system ruang”-a government system which has responsibility to give the wealthiness of its people by doing a good government, participated in empowering its people in order to create a well-established community, and bring Jakarta as a friendly Megapolitan city. So that, by stating the utterance, the candidate tells audiences about Jakarta which will give its people the same opportunity to get good chances for living as well as chances for the better economics. Furthermore, by uttering this utterance, the audience will get more information about Jakarta’s situation, about people’s life condition in Jakarta, and about the future Governor’s plan for Jakarta.
  - b. *“Kami menempatkan Jakarta bukan sebagai tempat uji coba”*. This utterance shows that the candidate states they do not want to take Jakarta as a place to have a trial in governing. By stating this utterance, the audience know that if they vote for the candidate, they will have a well-experienced Governor who has competence in governing. From the utterance, the candidate tells the audience that they will consistent to rule Jakarta whenever they win the election.
  - c. *“Keadilan atas lapangan pekerjaan sangat mendasar”*. The utterance tells audience about the basic needs of people. The candidate states that one of the reason of people come to Jakarta is because of its jobs opportunity. To get better job in Jakarta is much more challenging than in another place in Indonesia. So that, the balance and fair of getting job easily is important for everyone. Here, by the utterance, the candidate declares to the voters as well as to audiences that they will support the fairness of easy way in having a god job in Jakarta.

The above examples show that the candidates’ utterances are used to state different thing about Jakarta and tell their voters that they have different planning in winning the voters’ voice. They

state their future program when they become the Governor via declarative utterances. From the utterances above, it can be said that the declarative utterances uttered by the candidates are aimed to inform people about something.

2. Representative utterances. The representative utterances show candidates believe about a true thing and they want their voters and audiences to have the same belief as the candidates. In the debate, utterances used by the candidates represent different thing: believe, claim, and predict. By their utterances, the candidates tell audiences about what they believe, what they predict, or they claim something. It can be seen from the following utterances:

- a. *“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”.*
- b. *“Makanya **kami sangat yakin**, yang paling utama yang harus dibereskan adalah birokrasi dengan pejabat dengan rekam jejak yang jelas, sudah bersih, transparan, professional”.*

In the above utterances, the candidates believe about something. The candidate in utterance (a) believes that the program could be accomplished. The program that they plan to do can be done if they are supported by a good birocrate and professional people. It can be seen by the use of the phrase ‘kami sangat yakin ...’. So that by uttering the utterance, the candidate wants their voters to have the same belief as they are. In the utterance (b) shows that the candidate also believes about something by uttering ‘makanya kami sangat yakin, ...’. By uttering the utterance, the candidate is sure that their programs need staffs with good track records to support them. Here, based on the above representative utterances the candidates tell people about their belief on something that could be true and wants their voters to have the same view as they do.

- c. *“Kami hadir di Jakarta **membawa pengalaman, pengetahuan, dan akumulasi jaringan**”.*

From the above utterance, the candidate informs their voters and audiences that they are capable to govern Jakarta. The candidate claims themselves as the best candidate or ruling Jakarta since they have experiences, good knowledge, and they are the chosen one. By uttering “*Kami hadir di Jakarta membawa pengalaman, pengetahuan, dan akumulasi jaringan*”, the candidate wants to convince their voters that they are the one who will bring Jakarta to become the modern and good capital city. The candidate convinces the voters that they can create a megapolitan city

with their experiences. By claiming one thing through their utterance, it is seen that the candidate wants their voters put their trust on them to govern Jakarta.

- d. *“Visi saya **lima tahun ke depan** adalah menjadikan Jakarta semakin maju, aman, adil, dan sejahtera”.*

The above utterance shows candidate’s future planning. By uttering the utterance, the candidate wants to tell the voters about Jakarta’s condition in the five years ahead with them as Governor and Vice Governor. By uttering “... lima tahun ke depan ...”, the candidate predicts that they will change Jakarta into more modern, secure, and bring the prosperity to the city in the next five years.

3. Expressive utterances. The expressive utterances show that the candidates use utterances to show what they feel toward one condition. The utterances can be used to tell their grateful of one situation, can be used to criticize their opponents of doing something, or to praise other for doing something. The utterances are:

- a. *“Tapi saya **bersyukur** sebagian orang Jakarta melihat hasil nyata, sungai lebih bersih, semua kelihatan, pelayanan lebih baik”.*

The candidate utters the above utterance to show how they thankful or grateful of something. Here, the candidate shows their grateful to Jakarta people for witnessing their works during their time as Jakarta’s leader. By uttering “saya bersyukur”, the candidate uses the phrase to show their feeling of grateful.

- b. *“Selain yang sudah baik, potret Jakarta hari ini, **ketimpangan meningkat, daya beli sebagian masyarakat menurun. Di samping itu kualitas hidup masyarakat menurun akibat banjir, macet, sampah yang tidak bisa terselesaikan dengan baik. Dan yang paling menyedihkan adalah, di sana-sini warga Jakarta banyak yang takut terhadap pemerintahnya sendiri”.***

The utterances above uttered by the candidate showing that they candidate criticize their opponents about one situation. Based on the above utterances, the critics are about the condition of Jakarta that are imbalance in some ways.

- c. *“Saya **mendapat kehormatan** bersama-sama Mas Anies dalam kurun waktu 12 bulan terakhir berkeliling menjelajah ke 44 kecamatan, 267 kelurahan di wilayah Jakarta”.*

From the utterance above, it can be seen that in his utterance the candidate said “Saya mendapat kehormatan ...”. The candidate expresses his feeling of praise because of having a good partner.

By this utterance, everyone can see that the utterance is uttered to tell other about the feeling of the speaker.

Based on the expressive utterances above, the speaker use language to express what they feel and the emotion they have toward something. They utter the utterances to tell others that they feel thankful of good condition, the criticize or complaint using language to tell others that they annoyed of something, or even they tell a good thing about another person that show how much they praise each other.

4. Directive utterance. The directive utterance shows the speaker uses language to make the hearer does some actions. The directive utterances can occur as:

- a. *“Nah untuk mencapai visi itu, misi yang utama adalah birokrasi **harus melayani** dengan konsep bersih, transparan, dan professional”.*

From the utterance uttered by the candidate “... birokrasi harus melayani ...”, the candidate implies that they command all staff to serve the citizen professionally. By saying “... birokrasi harus melayani ...”, it is not only the staff to do the command but also the candidates themselves. In this utterance, the utterance is aimed the hearer to do something. It is supported by the use of the word “harus” which oblige everyone in birocration to do the action. So that, when the candidate won the election, they want all parties to serve people.

- b. *“Lalu kita didik anak-anak itu sehingga menjadi anak-anak yang berakhlak, anak yang berkarakter, anak yang berkompeten”.*

In the above utterance, the speakers ask the hearer to be with them to do something. In this case, they want Jakarta people to work and join with them to educate all children. By using ‘kita’ the speakers persuade not only themselves but also everyone in Jakarta to do the action.

- c. *“Posisi kita tegas. Kita **menolak reklamasi**. Karena ini adalah contoh bagaimana kita akan menyaksikan sebuah tempat yang nanti akan menjadi enclave”.*

From the utterance, the speakers want to call for everyone to do the same thing as they do. By saying “Kita menolak reklamasi”, the speakers call everyone to refuse the reclamation in Jakarta. The speakers use “kita” to indicate that to refuse the reclamation should be done by the speakers and Jakarta people.

From the utterances, it can be seen that the directive utterances are uttered in different purpose. Sometimes, speakers uttered this utterance to persuade hearer to do something, or to call for hearer to do something, and to commands hearer to do something.

5. Commissive utterance. The commissive utterances tell the hearer about speakers' intentions.

They may tell about something they want to do, or they tell the hearer about something they will do for the hearer. The commissive utterances can be seen as:

a. ***“Kami akan tegas memerangi narkoba hingga tuntas di kota ini”***.

From the utterance, the speakers use “Kami akan tegas memerangi ...” to tell hearer that they will do fighting against the drugs when they become the Governor of Jakarta. by uttering the utterance, it can be seen that the speakers promise to their hearer about the action they will take in the future. The promise is supported by using the word “akan” which show the action is not done yet.

b. ***“Dengan paradigma tersebut, saya akan berdiri yang terdepan bersama warga Jakarta untuk mengubah warga ibukota menjadi semakin modern, unggul, tetapi tetap menjadi kota yang manusiawi ...”***

By saying “saya akan berdiri ...” show to hearer that the speakers commit to do something. In this utterance, the speakers commit to stand for all Jakarta people to create the modern, sophisticated city, yet with its humanist. By hearing the utterance, the hearer will know that the speakers will do their commitment.

Based on the above utterances, it can be seen that the commissive utterances show the hearer about speakers' promise and commitment to do something to their hearer.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

From the previous description, it can be seen that there were different utterances uttered by the Governor candidates during the debate session. All candidates tried to take the viewers' attention by showing their talent in ruling Jakarta for the next five years. Based on the discussion above, each utterance was uttered for different functions. The first was to tell everyone about some conditions in Jakarta by using declarative utterance. So that, the audience will get more information about Jakarta's situation, about people's life condition in Jakarta, and about the future Governor's plan for Jakarta.

The second was to tell people about their belief on something that could be true and wants their voters to have the same view as they do. Besides that, the candidate predicts that they will change Jakarta into more modern, secure, and bring the prosperity to the city in the next five years. Here, the candidates uttered representative utterances.

Then, the utterances were to tell others that the candidates felt thankful of good condition, though they also criticized or complained about something, or even they told viewers a good thing about another person that showed how much they praised each other. These utterances were shown the expressive utterances.

After that, candidates uttered utterances to persuade hearer to do something, or to call for hearer to do something, and to commands hearer to do something. The candidate persuades everyone to serve Jakarta people, together to educate the children, or to call everyone to refuse any action that give bad beneficial to Jakarta. All candidates utter declarative utterances to ask people to take action.

Finally, candidates uttered commissive utterances. The viewers recognized two things. The first candidate committed to fight against drug in Jakarta. The candidate promises not to let drug seller expands and remain in Jakarta and protect the young citizens from becoming the drug users. Then, the promise to develop Jakarta into more modern, sophisticated city, yet with its humanist atmosphere and people was another commissive utterance.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Bantany, N. F. (2013). The use of commissive speech acts and its politeness implication: A case of Banten gubernatorial candidate debate. *Passage, 1*(2), 21-34.
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, John W. 2014. *Research Design*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Jagero, J. A. (2012). Politics and international criminal court debate: A critical discourse analysis of utterances by politicians in Kenya. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(11), 477-481.
- Kreidler, Charles W. 1998. *Introducing English Semantics*. New York: Routledge
- Ilie, C. (2003). Discourse and metadiscourse in parliamentary debates. *Journal of language and Politics, 2*(1), 71-92.
- Moleong, Lexy J. 2007. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif* (Edisi Revisi). Bandung: ROSDA.
- Nuryanti, D. (2019). Showing Emotion of Surprise Using Metaphorical Expression by Arabic Descendent Community. *ESENSI LINGUA, 1*(1), 42-50.
- Rosyidi, A. Z., Mahyuni, M., & Muhaimi, M. (2019). Illocutionary Speech acts use by Jokowi Widodo in first Indonesia Presidential Election Debate 2019. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 6*(2), 735-740.
- Searle, John R. 1981. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zwTDcJQosdE> (accessed on 26 Agustus 2019)