

The Persuasive Utterances in a Political Discourse

(The Case Study of the Regent Election Campaign of Pasuruan, East Java-Indonesia)

Kani Sulam Taufik (Corresponding author)

The Student of PhD Program of Pragmatic Linguistics

Sebelas Maret University “UNS” Surakarta, Indonesia

Tel: 62-812-528-67349

E-mail: sullamtaufik@gmail.com

Samiati Tarjana & Joko Nurkamto

Post Graduate Program of Pragmatic Linguistic Department

Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta (UNS), Indonesia

Tel: 62-027-163-2450

Received: Dec. 16, 2013

Accepted: February 18, 2013

Published: February 28, 2014

doi:10.5296/ijl.v6i1.4780

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v6i1.4780>

Abstract

This article describes the result of the research study of persuasive utterances used by the campaign speakers of the Regent and vice Regent election at Pasuruan, East Java. The specific aim of the study is to describe *the patterns, strategies and culture-social norms* of persuasive utterances used in the political campaign based on the pragmatic perspective. Theoretically, persuasive utterances are defined as the ones to influence and convince the hearers to do the acts wanted by the speakers. Therefore, the utterance types can be categorized into ‘directive-speech acts’. Having been pragmatically studied, however, the persuasive utterances which have been functioned as ‘directive-speech acts’, are not merely used in ‘directives’ but also in other speech-acts such as: *assertive/representatives, commissives, expressives, and declaration*. That’s why, they can be classified into ‘directives’ in the form of *direct utterances* and ‘directives’ in the form of *indirect utterances*. Then, in this study *direct utterances* are categorized into ‘directives’ while *indirect utterances* are

categorized into combination forms such as: *assertive-directives*, *commissive-directives*, *expressive-directives*, and *declaration-directives*. Besides reflecting *the patterns*, these speech-acts also reflected *the strategies* of utterances in which the norms of culture and social life of the local people can be described. These norms can be identified based on the utterance forms and strategies that the speakers used and also the attitudes or social behaviors that they showed, such as: politeness, the harmony of the team work, and their obedience to *kiai* or *ulama* (Moslem scholars) in determining their political wisdom. Thus, the persuasive utterances and persuasive acts produced by the speakers can be said to have an impact to the norms of *positive* and *negative* politeness of speakers and hearers.

Keywords: Pragmatic study, Persuasive utterances, Directive speech-acts, Strategies of utterances, Political campaign, Norms of social life

1. Introduction

The back ground of the study is based on the impoliteness of political campaign events held by the political parties by the time of the General Election of the House of Representatives and the Head of Government (President, Governor, Regent and Mayor). The problems above were mostly seen from the deviation of campaign regulations or campaign ethics, such as distributing the media of campaign (the pictures of candidates) broadly before the time of campaign came.

Referring to the background of the study, this research is categorized as ‘qualitative’ in the form of ‘ethnography’. Related to the research design mentioned above, then the aims of the study are focused on the descriptions of the utterance *patterns*, *strategies*, and *norms of culture and social life* which were produced by each utterance such as: the politeness of utterances, the politeness of persuasive acts, and political culture behaved by the persuaders.

To achieve the goal of the study, then the researcher analyzed 151 utterances of the total number of 460 utterances which were available in a data corpus. Those utterances were analyzed using techniques and approaches of the following dimensions: (1) dimension of pragmatic theories, (2) dimension of persuasion theories, and (3) dimension of social and culture theories.

1.1 Dimension of Pragmatic Theories.

Theoretically, this study cannot be separated from pragmatic theories argued by the linguists, such as Austin, the Britain linguist (1962) who argued the earliest speech-act theory. This theory was adopted from Malinowski’s views (1923) which show that each utterance made by a speaker is an act. In this case, Malinowski argued that language was not only used as a means of saying the words but also doing the acts. Even, in a *phatic* communication, what a speaker says also produces an act. The other linguists who developed Malinowski’s theory are Jacobson (1960), Searle (1969), and Kreidler (1998). Then, these linguists’ arguments were followed by Hymes (1964, 1972, 1974) who introduced the theory of ‘ethnography of speaking’. In this case, he argued that the culture and language were applied in the speech-acts made by a speaker.

Related to the speech-act theory described above, Hymes (1962), furthermore, proposed some components of speech-acts, namely: time and place, participants and their background, such as: age, gender, education, social status etc. The other components of speech acts are: *channel*, *code*, *topic*, *message* and *culture norms* of interaction and expectation. These components are formulated in an acronym of SPEAKING. This acronym represents speech-act components, namely: *setting* or a *place* where the conversation takes place, *participants* or speaker and the hearer involved in conversation, *ends* or the purpose of conversation, *act sequences* or turn-taking in conversation, *keys* or the tone that indicates the spirit of speaking, *instrumentalities* or the channel of communication (language) used in conversation, *norms of interaction* or social behavior or culture context, and *genres* or language varieties (dialect or idiolect).

Referring to the description above, Austin explained in his book “How to Do Things with

Words” in which he said that while a speaker is saying a word he or she is also doing an act. Thus, while a speaker is saying “I promise that I will come on time” or “I apologize for coming late” or “I name this ship Elizabeth” means that he or she does not only utter the utterances but also does the acts of promising, apologizing, and giving a name. These utterances are categorized into *performative* ones because the *verbs* used by the speakers (to promise, to apologize, and to name) are *performative* verbs which produce an act to be done. That’s why, all utterances made the speakers above can be stated as an action of uttering the words. The other categories are “constatives” or the utterances which indicate the expressions of ‘Where are you going?’; Let’s go; He is going to Surabaya (Rani, 2004: 158). Uttering these words, the speaker does not have to do an act as it is in ‘performatives’. In other words, the speaker is not obliged to do an act related to the words or expressions he or she said. However, it is difficult to make a distinction between *performatives* and *constatives* because both of them use the verbs which represent an act too. Thus, Austin made a conclusion that each utterance either it is ‘performative’ or ‘constative’ could be said as the utterances containing the acts (Renkema, 1993, 2004: 22).

Related to the concepts above, Austin (1976) made three categories of speech-act classification, namely: *locutionary* acts, *illocutionary* acts and *perlocutionary* acts. *Locutionary* acts are made by a speaker in order to produce the utterances, then *illocutionary* acts are made in order to express the speaker’s intention, such as making a promise, a threat, a praise or an oath. Meanwhile, *perlocutionary* acts are utterances produced by the speaker in order to make the hearer do the acts in accordance with speaker’s intentions. These acts are performed (by the hearer) by giving a response to the demands or requests made by the speaker.

The descriptions given above indicate that the meaning of an utterance is not only determined by *locutionary acts* produced by the speaker but also the *illocutionary acts* in which the speaker’s intention is made. Thus, the meaning or the function of an utterance in speech-acts can merely be analyzed based on the acts of illocution made by the speaker. In other words, the hearer will be able to give any responses to the utterances made by the speaker if he or she understands the intention of speaker’s utterances. Therefore, the communication will be successful if the hearer can give responses well. In this case, the acts of illocution can be considered successful, as the hearer can perform the acts asked by the speaker. The other views stated that the acts of communication will be successful if the utterances made the speaker fulfill the standard of felicity conditions. It means that the speaker who makes *a promise, a request or a demand* must consider felicity conditions in order to make them well performed. It has been argued by Searle (1965, 1969) that felicity conditions must contain four characteristics to make ones have an effect to the hearer. They are ‘propositional-content’, ‘preparatory-condition’, ‘sincerity-condition’ and ‘essential-condition’. In other words, the utterances made by the speaker must provide the possible acts to do in the future. This view gives an illustration to the writer that persuasive utterances made by the speakers in political campaign must also consider the conditions above.

1.2 Dimension of Persuasion Theories

Related to the utterances used by the campaign speakers, it can be stated that most of the utterances used in campaign activity aimed at affecting and convincing the audiences in order that they keep following the speakers' intentions. According to Simons (1976: 19) the notion of persuasion is to make manipulative acts, but it also leaves receivers with the perception of choice. It involves attempted influence such as a politician attempts to attract votes, a legislator seeks a bill, or a student seeks permission to take a make-up exam. In some contexts it may be appropriate to refer to "persuasion" as an effect already produced by messages, whether intended or not. This concept can be comprehended that a persuader needs some strategies in order to convince the voters. In the field, the strategies of communication used by the persuaders in campaign activities were classified in to (a) strategy with speech-act oriented, and (b) strategy with mass gathering oriented. Therefore, the persuasive acts done by the campaign speakers can also be identified through their language and social behaviors.

Referring to the concept above, the approaches used in this research study are focused on the strategies of speech-acts, namely: (a) the principles of *directness* and *indirectness* (Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987), and (b) the principles of persuasion (Cialdini, 1984). Thus, in the case of language behavior (speech-acts), the strategies used by the campaign speakers might be *direct strategies* and/or *indirect strategies*. Meanwhile, in the case of social behavior, the persuaders used the strategies of social approaches by doing the real actions, such as: visiting some important persons in the villages, giving a rewards, distributing *sembako* (basic necessities) etc. These strategies are also categorized into *indirect ones* because they are not conducted by saying the persuasive words or utterances *on record*. Thus, the campaign speakers try to ask or convince the voters to support and choose the candidates by using the *indirect strategies* or *off record*. Using this theory, the persuaders (the speakers) can use the six persuasive principles argued by Cialdini (1984), namely: (a) *consistence*, (b) *authority*, (c) *reciprocal*, (d) *social-evidence*, (e) *preference* and (f) *rareness*. The concepts of these strategies are described below.

The first is *Consistence*. This strategy means that the persuader (the speaker) is obliged to tell the messages honestly or not to tell a lie. In other words, he/she must be able to keep the quality of the utterances while he/she is making a speech communication (Grice, 1975). The second is *Authority*. It is a persuasive strategy in which a persuader plays himself/herself as if he/she were a powerful person. In this case, if he/she were a candidate of regent, for example, he/she must be able to convince the audiences or voters that he/she is a real regent. Thus, he/she must be able to give a speech or to solve the problems wisely, as if he/she were a real regent. The third is *Reciprocal* strategy. It is a kind of strategy to attract a voters' sympathy by doing the acts in reciprocal ways. For examples, the candidates promise to omit the school fee of SD (Elementary School), SMP (Junior High School), and SMA (Senior High School) if they were elected as the Regent and Vice Regent of Pasuruan. In other words, the candidates promise to give some rewards in the form of school fee omission to the voters after being elected, and on the contrary, the voters give their votes to the candidates.

The fourth is *Social-Evidence* strategy. It is a strategy in which a group of society or a big number of people is used as the evidence that the candidates are mostly preferred by the people. This strategy is used by showing the facts that the candidates have really been supported by most of the people either it is from the lowest strata or the highest one. For example, the persuaders make a sense of popularity by expanding the pictures of the candidates of which the popular or powerful people such as *kiai* or *ulama* (Moslem scholars) used as the back ground of the pictures. These kinds of pictures show that the candidates have been supported by the *kiai* or *ulama* (Moslem scholars). The fifth is *preference strategy*. It is a kind of strategy which is *applied* by making a communication among the voters who have the same preferences or perception to the superiorities of the candidates. In this case, the voters make a networking one another and give their supports to the candidates proposed by the persuaders. The sixth is *Rareness* strategy. It means that a persuader tries to attract the audiences' sympathy by creating the luxurious situations. For examples, the persuaders try to create the superiority of the candidates by making their position more superior than the others. In this way, the people (voters) will be ready to support and elect them seriously because they have been made interested in the candidates by creating the situation or the condition of them different from the others.

1.3 Dimension of Culture Theories

This study is a kind of qualitative research in the form of ethnography. As a qualitative research, it tries to describe what and how the persuasive utterances were used in the campaign activities. Then, in the form of ethnography, the utterances used by the speakers were analyzed based on the norms of culture and social life of local society. In this case, the writer describes the social behaviors of the campaign speakers based on what they uttered and behaved in the field during the activities of campaign. Therefore, the research data was collected by recording the speech and conducting an observation in the field. The collected data were persuasive utterances used by the campaign speakers and field notes of observation result. This study is based on the Spradley's view (1980: 5-6) and Nunan (1992) which stated that the aim of an ethnography research is to describe the behaviors, knowledge, and culture based on the views of their society. Then, these views were specifically described by using the theory of "communication ethnography" argued by Hymes (1962).

According to Hymes, the research study of "communication ethnography" can be focused on (a) the patterns of communication, (b) the strategies of communication, (c) the components of communicative competence, (d) the relationship of a language with the social institutions, and (e) the universality of linguistic distinction and social behavior of the speakers. Related to the problems of this research study, the writer specifically focused his study on the *forms*, *strategies* and *positive norms* of persuasive utterances used by the campaign speakers to the cultural and social behaviors. They include the politeness of utterances, cultural and social behaviors done by the speakers during campaign activities.

Referring to the descriptions above, the forms of persuasive utterances can be identified with the theory of speech-acts argued by Searle (1979), namely *assertive*, *commissives*, *expressive*, *declaration* and *directives*. Since the utterances of persuasion in campaign activities had the

function of *demand*, *request* and *convincing* the audiences or voters to elect the available candidates, all of the utterance forms can be categorized into *directives*. These speech-acts, however, are combined into one another so that out of the ‘*authentic-directives*’ they can use combinations of illocutionary acts, namely: *assertive-directives*, *commissive-directives*, *expressive-directives*, and *declaration-directives* (Prabarani, 2000). Furthermore, the utterance forms were identified to determine the specific strategies of utterances by using the theories of *directness* and *indirectness* (Leech, 1983, Brown and Levinson, 1987). In this case the writer used the cost and benefit scale and also the theory of face-threatening acts to determine the politeness and impoliteness of utterances. These strategies were also integrated into persuasive-principles argued by Cialdini (1984), namely: *consistence*, *authority*, *reciprocal*, *social-evidence*, *preference* and *rareness* in order to identify the persuasive acts performed by the persuaders. Thus, the norms of social and culture behaved by the persuaders in the campaign activities could be adapted to Cialdini’s theory above. Thus, the writer could describe *how far the forms and the strategies of persuasive-utterances used by the persuaders in political campaign could be provide the positive or negative impact to the politeness of utterances as well as the cultural and social behaviors of the campaign speakers.*

2. Discussion of Findings

In this study, the writer analyzed the persuasive utterances based on the types of speech-acts argued by Searle (1979), namely: *directives*, *assertive*, *commissive*, *expressive*, and *declaration*. These speech-acts are combined into one another to adapt the forms or patterns of utterances used by the campaign speakers. In this case, the terms of speech-acts to be used are (1) *direct-speech acts*, (2) *indirect-speech acts*. Direct-speech acts reflected the bald on record-utterances of which the directness of commands, demands or requests were used. Therefore, the shapes of these speech acts can be categorized as ‘*authentic-directives*’. Then, indirect-speech acts reflected the bald off record-utterances of which the indirectness of commands, demands or requests were used. Thus, these speech acts consists of: (a) *authentic-directives*, (b) *assertive-directives*, (c) *commissive-directives*, (d) *expressive-directives*, and (e) *declaration-directives*. The examples of the research findings are presented as below:

2.1 The Direct-Speech Acts (Authentic-Directives)

These speech acts are the reflection of ‘*authentic-directives*’ because they have a function to make an order or a request of doing the acts wanted by the speaker. These speech acts are uttered *on record*. It means that the speakers persuade the audiences by saying the demands or requests in the forms of *directness* or imperative utterances, such as the ones presented below:

H. Sutrisno, *Jurkam Pasangan nomor 2*: “*Hadirin yang berbahagia,*

Kalau ingin perubahan di Kab Pasuruan, hanya satu jawabannya. Tanggal 18 Mei Coblos No. 2, coblos Dade Angga dan Eddy Paripurna. Betul? Karena, hanya beliau berdua yang berani merubah Pasuruan lebih baik dari sekarang. Tepuk tangannya mana dong ! (korpus data no.311)

(H. Sutrisno, the candidate pairs of no. 2: “Ladies and gentlemen, if you want Pasuruan Regent to be better than before, the only answer is *choose the candidate pairs of number 2 or choose Dade Angga and Eddy Paripurna on 18th May*, Right? The reason, both of them are the only candidates who have the bravery to make Pasuruan Regent better than before, nowadays. Give your applause!”)

Based on the utterances above, it could be said that the speaker persuaded the audiences that the candidate pairs of number two were the only ones who had bravery to change Pasuruan better than before, for the future. Therefore, the speaker asked the audiences to choose the candidates of number two, i.e. *Dade Angga and Eddy Paripurna* in order to realize their wishes. The demands were uttered *on record* by saying “Choose *Dade Angga and Eddy Paripurna*”. So, the type of the utterance can be classified into *directive-speech acts* because the speaker’s wishes to choose the candidates were stated *on record*. The findings of the study showed that the campaign speakers used these types of speech acts up to 153 utterances (33, 26 %) of the total number. These utterances were distributed into speech-acts, such as: utterance of command, utterance of request, utterance of criticism, utterance of warning, utterance of invitation, utterance of proposal, and utterance of offer etc. In other words, the utterance forms that they used have a direct relationship with the function of their illocutionary acts.

However, in the terms of persuasive utterances, the writer found that the directness of speech acts hardly ever stand alone. They often use the supporting utterances to attract the sympathetic power of the audiences. That’s why those utterances always seem to be longer and more complete than the real utterances. As the example above, it is clearly identified that the speaker not only asked the audiences to choose the candidates directly but also persuaded them by giving some more attractive tantalizations to make them interested in the candidates. The tantalizations that they made were the offer of a better change for Pasuruan in the future. In this way, the persuasive utterances used by the campaign speakers can be categorized into speech acts of ‘directives’.

According to its strategy the utterance “Choose *Dade Angga and Eddy Paripurna*” can be categorized into *direct* strategy or *on record* strategy. In the terms of politeness, this strategy tends to reflect impolite behaviors (Brown and Levinson, 1987) because it must have contained *impositive* acts or face threatening acts. This view was also supported by Leech (1983) who argued that the directness of speech acts tends to produce the impoliteness of language behaviors because it is in contrast with the cost and benefit maxim. Using this view, the utterances which use the strategy of directness can be categorized as an impolite language behavior. In other words, the campaign speakers must use *indirectness* of speech acts to keep the politeness of language behavior.

However, if it is seen from the language variety of Indonesian, it can be said that the speaker used a formal variety. It means that he used standard language of Indonesian. Theoretically, a formal variety has a tendency to give negative face of which the intimacy between the speaker and hearer cannot be shaped. Thus, the utterance used in the data above can be classified into less than polite because of the directness, but its impoliteness decreases

because of the greeting expressions “*Hadirin yang berbahagia*” (the happy audiences) which means giving a praise to the audiences. Therefore, the utterance used in the data above contains more or less polite.

Out of the strategy mentioned above, the persuaders in campaign activities also used the persuasive-principles based strategy, namely: *consistence*, *authority*, *reciprocal*, *social-evidence*, *preference* and *rareness* (Cialdini, 1984). In accordance with these strategies, the imperative utterances such as “Choose *Dade Angga and Eddy Paripurna* because both of them are the only candidate-pairs who have bravery to change Pasuruan better than before” can be categorized as *authority* and *consistence-principles*. The reason is what the speaker said needs a power and a consistence of the speaker in order to make the audiences convinced with the candidates.

2.2 The Indirect-Speech Acts

In contrast with the *direct-speech acts* or directness in ‘directives’, the indirect-speech acts of persuasive utterances are made by making a demand or request, a command, and offers in the forms of persuasion *indirectly*. It means that the speakers made the utterances by saying them *off record*. The examples of each are presented below:

2.2.1 Assertive-Directives

H. Sutrisno, Tim Sukses *DaDi* : “*Para undangan yang kami hormati, khususnya masyarakat desa Gerbo: Pada hari ini, tanggal 10 Mei 2008, adalah kampanye akbar Pak Dade Angga dan Pak Eddy Paripurna, yang akan memimpin Pasuruan 2008-2013* ”. (korpus data no. 1)

(H. Sutrisno, Voluntary Team of *DaDi*: “The honorable audiences, especially for the peoples of Gerbo Village: Today, the tenth of May 2008 is the biggest campaign of Sir Dade Angga and Sir Eddy Paripurna who will be the leader of Pasuruan in 2008 up to 2013)

The utterances used in 2) contain persuasions of giving any support to the candidates of number 2, namely *DaDi* (Dade Angga – Eddy Paripurna). It means that the speaker influences the audiences to support and choose the candidates by giving some praises either to the audiences or the candidates. The first, the speaker praises the audiences by saying the greeting “the honorable audiences” which means that the speaker tries to make them happy and interested in the candidates that he offers. The second, he tries to praise his own team by saying that the campaign he held was the biggest one. By saying this utterance, it can be said that the proposed candidates are well supported by most of the people. Pragmatically, the candidates who have a big number of supporters are better than the others. Thus, the utterance means that he asked the audiences to choose the candidates by saying request *off record*. In this case, he did not convey his wishes by using *imperative* utterances as it was used in direct commands or requests. So, the speech acts he used are the combination of *directives* and *assertive*. This type of speech acts can be categorized into ‘*directive-assertive*’.

2.2.2 Commissive-Directives

Dade Angga: “*Nanti kalau Pak Dade Angga jadi bupati Pasuruan akan kita selesaikan kantor MWC itu. Allahu akbar 3x*”. (korpus data no. 120)

(Dade Angga: “If Sir Dade Angga successfully became the Regent of Pasuruan, the building of MWC Office will be finished. Then he said *Allahu akbar* three times which means that the speaker uttered some yells in the name of Almighty God”)

The persuasive utterances above indicate that the speaker persuaded the audiences by making a promise. The promise he made is ‘finishing the building of MWC Office’ if he were elected as the leader of Pasuruan. Pragmatically, the utterance means that the speaker asked the audiences to support and give their votes to him (speaker) in order to finish the mentioned building. However, he did not request the audiences by saying utterances in the form of *imperative* utterances. In this case, he expressed his wishes by saying *affirmative utterances*. Therefore, it can be said that the speech-acts that he uttered was expressed indirectly or *off record*. In other words, he made a promise in order to make the audiences support and give their votes for him. Thus, these speech-acts contain the illocutionary acts of *directives* and *commissives*.

2.2.3 Expressive-Directives

H.Sutrisno, Tim Sukses *DaDi*: “*Kami sangat berterimakasih kepada seluruh pendukung nomor 2, karena dapat melaksanakan kampanye dengan damai, dengan santun, tanpa kekerasan di mana-mana. Betul ? Betul ?*”. (korpus data no. 207)

(H. Sutrisno, Voluntary Team of *DaDi*: We are very grateful to the whole of the supporters of number two (a pair of no.2 candidates) as they can hold campaign activities peacefully, politely and without doing brutal acts everywhere. Is it right? Is it right?)

The utterances above were made in order to persuade the audiences of the campaign. In this case, the speaker who became a member of Voluntary Team of *DaDi* (a pair of no.2 candidates) intended to persuade the audiences to give their votes to Dade Angga-Eddy Paripurna or *DaDi*. His persuasion was made by expressing some praises, namely: thank-giving and admiring expressions. The thank-giving expression was given to the supporters because they could hold the campaigns well while the admiring expressions were made because the campaigns which were held could run well and peacefully. The speaker also praised that his supporters were able to hold the campaigns politely because he had never seen some brutal acts during their campaign activities. That’s why, all expressions that they used had the aims to persuade and also influence the audiences to choose the mentioned candidates. Such expressions in the terms of speech-acts can be classified in to ‘directives’ because they have some influences to the acts done by the hearers, namely: the audiences’ acts. In this case, the speaker tried to have the audiences support and elect the candidates by using ‘speech-acts of *xpressive*’, namely: utterances of thank-giving and admiring acts. Therefore, these speech-acts can be combined in to ‘*expressives-directive*’.

2.2.4 Declaration-Directives

Dade Angga Cabup Pasangan nomor 2: *Kami menyerahkan surat pernyataan siap tidak melakukan KKN kepada Kasi Pidum Kejari Bangil, Sucipto. Ini demi untuk mewujudkan kesejahteraan masyarakat Pasuruan*". (korpus data no. 294)

(Dade Angga, the pair of no. 2 candidates: We submitted the letter of statement not to do the KKN (the acts of corruption, collusion and nepotism) to the head of public criminal Law of Bangil, Sucipto. This is merely to shape the prosperity of Pasuruan people.

The persuasive utterances presented in the data above shows that the speaker tried to persuade and influence the audiences by saying utterances of declaration. In this case, the speaker declared that he would not do the acts of corruption, collusion and nepotism or KKN. These utterances can be categorized into speech-acts of *directives* because they function as a means of ordering or requesting the audiences to support and elect the candidates. However, the speaker did not order the audiences *on record*. In other words, the speaker did not use the utterances in *imperative* forms. He only used *declarative utterances*. Since the utterances have the function to have the audiences do the acts wanted by the speaker, they can be categorized into 'directives'. In this case, the shape of utterances that the speaker used contains the declaration that can produce the acts done by the audiences, namely giving their votes to the proposed candidates. Therefore, these speech-acts can be combined into 'directive-declaration'. The descriptions presented above show that the shapes of the speech-acts used by the campaign speakers to persuade the voters consist of combinations of the five speech-acts argued by Searle (1979), namely: *directives*, *xpressiv*, *commisives*, *xpressive* and *declaration*.

3. Strategies of Utterances and Norms of Social Life

Based on the shapes of persuasive utterances presented above, the writer tried to analyze the other pragmatic constituents, namely: (1) the strategies of utterances viewed from the persuasive principles, and (2) the social and culture norms of utterances viewed from the politeness principles.

3.1 The Strategies of Utterances Viewed from the Persuasive Principles

The shapes of utterances presented above shows that there are two kinds of strategies used by the speaker to persuade the audiences, namely: *direct* and *indirect* strategies. *Direct* strategy permits the speaker to persuade the audiences *on record* while *indirect* strategy permits him to persuade them *off record*. These kinds of strategies can be identified based on the shapes of the speech-acts uttered by the speaker. Besides, these strategies also reflect the persuasive principles argued by Cialdini (1984), namely: *consistence*, *authority*, *reciprocal*, *social-evidence*, *preference* and *rareness*. According to him, these persuasive principles are the most effective strategies to persuade the others in order to become interested in the pair of candidates supported by the persuader. Therefore, the persuasive utterances made by the speakers in the campaign activities were found to use these strategies effectively. The data related to these findings are presented below:

3.1.1 Consistence Principle

Most of the persuasive utterances used in campaign activities reflect ‘*Consistence Principle*’. It occurs to them (utterances) because persuasive acts always need some honesty of the speaker to make the hearer convinced of what he said. So, if the speaker said “*JaDi is the best*” or “*JaDi would omit the school fee if they were elected as the Regent and vice Regent of Pasuruan*”, he must have expressed the utterances seriously. In other words, he may not tell a lie. Utterance reflecting this strategy was stated by the speaker, Muzammil: “*Kami membantu kebutuhan pondok-pondok pesantren di Pasuruan*” (Muzammil: “We have contributed the needs of Pesantren education foundation in Pasuruan”). The speech-acts used above, contain a high interest because most of the people in this area are very religious. It means that most of them have a very high obedience to the Moslem Scholar.

3.1.2 Authority Principle

This strategy is reflected in the utterances of imperatives or the shapes of speech-acts containing the illocution of ‘directives’. Thus, if the speaker persuaded the audiences by saying instructions *on record*, he must have used the *Authority Principle*. The shapes of utterances related to this strategy are used in the speech-acts reflecting the direct instructions, such as: Dade Angga: “*Pilih Dade Angga dan Eddy Paripurna*” (Dade Angga: “Choose *Dade Angga and Eddy Paripurna*”). Using this principle, however, the speaker needs to adjust his artificial power higher than the hearers’ in order to convince them.

3.1.3 Reciprocal Principle

This strategy is reflected from the persuasive utterances which contain the acts done by the persuader and the audiences reciprocally. In this case, the persuader attracted the audiences’ sympathy by giving contribution or a prize to the audiences. On the contrary, the persuader hopes that the audiences give their votes to the proposed candidates. This strategy might be done by giving a reward directly or making a promise as it is used in ‘Commissive-Directives’. As it was found by the writer, each pair of candidates can be said using this strategy. The utterances reflecting this strategy are: Dade Angga: “*Kami menyediakan hadiah 4 motor bagi peserta jalan sehat yang beruntung*” (Dade Angga: “We provide four motorcycles as a reward for the lucky participants of the healthy walking”)

The persuasive actions acted by the speaker were the gift of four motorcycles. The motorcycles given by the candidates had a reciprocally purpose to have the voters give their votes to the candidates in general election of Regent.

3.1.4 Social-Evidence Principle

This strategy is reflected from the persuasive utterances which contain the social-evidence reflecting the acts, such as a bigger number of people who factually support the candidates. This strategy was made by showing the actual social evidence through the height of the supporters given to the candidates. In this case, the candidates who were able to show their supporters in a big number, they would have a better record from the society. The findings related to this strategy are reflected in utterances uttered by H.Sutrisno: “*Masyarakat sangat*

akrab dengan Pak Dade dan Pak Eddy” (The peoples are very close to Sir Dade and Sir Eddy”). This utterance shows that the candidates have a close relationship with the people of Pasuruan. It means that the people mostly expected the leader who is close to them in order to shape a good government.

3.1.5 Preference Principle

The utterances related to this strategy are the ones which produced the acts of which the people must find the supporters who have the similar wishes or preference. This strategy is done by visiting certain people to enlarge the nets of communication. In this way, the connected people were obliged to make the next communication with the others in order to increase the number of supporters. Such strategies will provide the people who have the same perception so that the connected chain can be continuously shaped. As it was said by Muzammil: “*Kami mengadakan kunjungan ke sejumlah pondok pesantren dan membagikan sembako kepada anak-anak yatim*” (Muzammil said: “We visited some *Pesantren* houses to distribute the *sembako* (something related to the basic needs such as food, drink etc.) to the orphans. What the persuader did in these activities was to make the intimate relationship with the owner or the manager of *Pesantren* houses. In this way, the owner or the *Kiai* of *Pesantren* will request his students to support the candidates by inviting their family or their parents.

3.1.6 Rareness Principle

Using this strategy, a persuader is demanded to be able to create the candidates become very rare or different from the others. In this case, the candidates are treated as the ones needed by the voters. For examples, persuading by showing up their education, popularity, honesty, capability, electability etc. Based on the researcher’s observation and his analysis, it was known that the utterances containing the strategy of rareness were expressed by one of the campaign speaker as follow: Muzammil said: “*Ikuti jalan sehat bersama pasangan calon JaDi, berhadiah haji 2 orang*”. (Join the healthy walking held by the pair of candidates *JaDi*, with the prize *haji* for 2 persons). *Haji* means going to Makah and Medina to implement the fifth pillar of Islam. The persuasive acts made by the persuaders (the candidates) were very rare because what he said was not done by the others. So, this strategy is the only one made by the candidates of *JaDi* (Muzammil-Zubaidi)

3.2 The Social And Cultural Norms of Utterances Viewed from Politeness Principles.

The shapes and strategies of the utterances described above, provide the norms of culture and social life owned by the persuaders or the campaign speakers, namely: (1) the speakers’ politeness, (2) the attitude and speakers’ behaviors. These norms are described as follow:

3.2.1 The Speakers’ Politeness

According to Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987) the utterance shapes and strategies used by a speaker must have been certainly said to have politeness values. Leech used ‘cost and benefit theory’ while Brown and Levinson used the theory of ‘face threatening acts’ or FTA. Based on these theories, the politeness of an utterance can be seen whether or not it gives the benefiter and/or face threatening acts to the hearer. Therefore, they agree to

use the strategies of directness (on record) and indirectness (off record) in order to determine the politeness of an utterance. Thus, the longer the utterances the speaker makes, the more politely they are uttered.

The findings of the study show that the shapes and the strategies used by the persuaders (campaign speakers) were mostly *indirectness*. In other words, the speakers had a tendency to persuade the audiences or voters by saying their persuasive utterances *off record*. From the 460 utterances that the writer analyzed, the 400 utterances (87%) were categorized in to *indirectness*, the rest or 60 utterances (13%) were *directness*. Thus, based on the theories argued by the two linguists above, most of the persuasive utterances made by the speakers in a political campaign can be categorized as *polite utterances*. However, in this study, the writer also got some interesting findings, namely: the *indirect* utterances which contain *impolite acts*, such as “*Orang yang tidak ias berdiri atau orang yang sakit-sakitan tidak usah dipilih*” (The man who cannot stand up or the one who has serious pain is unnecessary to be voted). This utterance is said to give impolite acts because it contains some expressions which can make other candidates get angry. So, the utterance is longer and complete but it does not give some polite acts.

3.2.2 The Attitude and Speakers’ Behaviors

The shapes and strategies of utterances used by the persuaders or speakers also gave the reflection of the speakers’ attitude and social behaviors. These behaviors also reflected the culture of local people, namely: the culture of ‘*nurut kiai*’ (the obedience of people to Moslem scholars). The result of observation conducted by the writer shows that the people of Pasuruan are known as religious people. Most of them are Moslems that have higher loyalty to the religion that they believed in. Therefore, their attitudes and behaviors can influence their political attitudes and social life. It can be seen from the winner of general election (Pemilu) followed by the political Parties in this area from period to period. In this case, the winners were always dominated by Islamic Parties, such as *Partai Persatuan Pembangunan* (PPP) or “The Development Unity Party” and *Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa* (PKB) or “The Nation Resurrection Party”. Therefore, in political campaign the candidates always need the help of *kiai* or *ulama* (Moslem scholars) very much. Without it, they will not get the powerful supporters from the society. In this case, they also used the strategies of persuasive principles argued by Cialdini (1984) in order to approach the influential people.

Besides that, the writer found that the candidates and their supporters always kept “the culture of harmony” in order to achieve their political target. They always worked in harmony in order to win their candidates. This strategy reflected the culture of Javanese of which the individuals must have helped among the others in order to be able to achieve happiness, welfare, and peaceful life. These acts are suitable with the Javanese proverb: *Rukun agawe santoso crah agawe bubrah* (The unity will strengthen the brotherhood, the disharmony causes hostility).

4. Conclusion

Pragmatically, the patterns of persuasive-utterances used by the speakers are classified into

two types, namely: (a) *direct-speech acts* and (b) *indirect speech acts*. ‘Direct-speech acts’ are the ones that contain *demands* or *requests* (*authentic-directives*). These utterances are spoken *directly* (*on record*) such as in “*Coblos nomor 2*” (choose number 2), while ‘indirect speech acts’ are spoken *indirectly* (*off record*), such as in “*JaDi adalah paling baik*” (*JaDi* is the best). These ones are classified into: (a) *Assertive/Representative-Directives*: “*Saudara-saudara sekalian bapak (penutur sendiri) adalah anggota nahdliyin*” (Ladies and gentlemen, I am the member of *nahdliyin*). *Nahdliyin* is the name of powerful mass organization in this district. In this way, the speaker will be supported by the most audiences because most of Pasuruan people are *nahdliyin Moslem*. (b) *Commissive-Directives*: “*Kami akan memperbaiki system pemerintahan kabupaten Pasuruan*” (We will improve the system of Pasuruan regent government). By making this promise, the audiences will become interested in the candidates because the promise can provide the joyfulness in the future. (c) *Expressive-Directives*: “*Guru-guru adalah pahlawan sejati, kesejahteraannya perlu ditingkatkan*” The teachers are the real heroes, their prosperousness must be improved and (d) *Declaration-Directives*: “*Saya yakin 85% masyarakat Gerbo akan mencoblos nomor 2*” (I’m sure that the people of Gerbo will choose no. 2 candidates). These patterns of the utterances were suitable with the ones argued by Searle (1979) and developed by Prabarani in her research study (2000). In use, the *indirect-speech acts* were more dominant than the *direct speech acts*. It is so called, as there were 460 utterances in this study, 400 utterances of them were speech acts of *indirect-directives* and 60 utterances of them were speech acts of *direct-directives*. In this study, the number of each was identified as follow: (a) *assertive-directives* were 81 utterances (17.60%), (b) *commissive-directives* were 106 utterances (23.04%), (c) *expressive-directives* were 76 utterances (16.52%), (d) *declaration-directives* were 44 utterances (9.57 %) and (e) *directive-speech acts* (*authentic-directives*) were 153 utterances (33.26%). If the speech-acts are identified from each aspect, the dominant number in use is the *directive-speech acts*. However, if they are identified from the total aspects, it can be said that they are less than *indirect-speech acts* because the distinction of each is too far.

The second, the strategies of persuasive-utterances used by the speakers consist of (a) utterances with *direct strategy*, and (b) utterances with *indirect strategy*. In this case, the strategies used by the speakers pragmatically illustrate the patterns of utterances. Thus, the *direct-speech acts* reflected the *direct strategies*, while the *indirect-speech acts* reflected *indirect strategies*. Having analyzed using the six principles of persuasive argued by Cialdini (1984), namely: *consistence, authority, reciprocal, social-evidence, preference* and *rareness*, the persuasive-utterances used by the speakers also reflected the acts which were done in the six principles above. If it is carefully observed, the six principles above can also be categorized as *indirect strategies* because the techniques which were mostly used by the speakers were presented in the forms of social behavior, such as: giving charity to the poor and orphans, relaxed walking with rewards, motor cycle parades, visiting *pesantren* houses, visiting popular scholars (*kiai* or *ulama*) and giving immediate contribution for public facilities.

The third, the strategies described above, provide the reflection of social and culture norms of

persuasive-utterances because the behavior of the speakers while they were speaking and gathering the people as it was done in the relaxed walking, mass-convoy, visiting public areas etc. were the reflections of the persuasive-utterances that they have uttered. That's why, based on the social and culture norms above, it can be identified that the politeness of the persuasive-utterances used by the speakers is *relatively high*. The researcher thinks that the height of politeness is mostly influenced by the contents of utterances which were not producing the *impolite acts* or *face threatening ones* (Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987). The indicators of the politeness are presented by the utterances which were implicitly expressed (*off record*). Besides, the politeness of speakers' behaviors and attitudes in the campaigns clearly reflected the norms of social life and culture of the local society. The type of the sympathetic campaigns like this was held in the field using relaxed ways, friendly and intimately.

Finally, the result of the study can be concluded as follow: (a) The patterns of persuasive-utterances which are theoretically categorized into 'directive-speech acts', mostly used *indirect utterances*. These forms were actualized in the 'directive-speech-acts' in the forms of: *assertive, commissives, expressives, and declaration*. (b) Most of the strategies used by the speakers were *indirect strategies*. These strategies were not in contrast with pragmatic theory and persuasive-principles argued by the experts (Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987; Cialdini, 1984). (c) Both the forms and strategies of persuasive-utterances used in the campaigns mostly reflected the *positive social norms*, namely: *the culture of politeness, the reciprocally helping, the unity or harmony, and the obedience to the kiai or ulama (scholars)* so that the politeness values became higher. These speakers' behaviors and attitudes can produce the '*positive politeness*' (d) The indirectness of persuasive-utterances spoken by the speakers do not guarantee the politeness of utterances because most of the *impolite utterances* found by the researcher, namely (92%) of them also used *indirect utterances*. It might occur that the language varieties used by the speakers mostly contain impolite utterances although their forms are *indirect*. Besides, the language varieties used by the speakers tend to use the *formal Indonesian languages* so that they can give *negative politeness*. That's why, the types of politeness used in spoken persuasive-utterances are '*positive and negative politeness*'. Based on the varieties of the language which were used it can be stated that the speakers had a strong tendency to behave *negative politeness*.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). (1965), (1976). *How To Do Things with Words*. London: Oxford. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001>
- Brown, Penelope, & S. C. Levinson. (1987). *Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena*, in Esther N. Goody (ed) *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cialdini, Robert B. (1984). *The Psychology Influence of Persuasion "Psikologi Persuasif" Merekayasa Kepatuhan*. (Indonesian Version, by Tri Wibowo Budi Santoso, 2005). Jakarta: Prenada Media.

- Grice, H. Paul. (1967). (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgans (Eds), *Syntax and Semantics, 3, Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press
- Hornby, A. S. (1984). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D. H. (1964). *Introduction: Towards Ethnographies of Communication*. *American Antropologist*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Hymes, Dell. (1962). (1972). *The Ethnography of Speaking*. in J. Fishman (Ed.) 1968. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110805376>
- Jakobson, Roman. (1960). 1964. *Concluding Statement: Linguistics and Poetics*. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press, p. 350.
- Kreidler, W. Charles. (1998). *Introducing English Semantics*. London: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203265574>
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Macrothink Institute™: *The Guide Lines of International Journal of Linguistics*. [Online] Available: <http://www.macrothink.org/author> (December 9, 2013)
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. (1923). *The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages*. In Ogden, C. K., & I. A. Richards (Ed.), *The Meaning of Meaning*. London: K. Paul, Trend dan Trubner.
- Nunan, David. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David. (1993). *Introduction Discourse Analysis*. London: The Penguin Group.
- Prabarani. (2000). *Speech Act Analysis of The Main Characters in 'The Joy Luck Club'*. Magister Thesis: State University of Malang "UM".
- Rani, Abdul dkk. (2004). *Analisis Wacana. "Sebuah Kajian Bahasa Dalam Pemakaian"*. Malang: Bayu Media Publishing.
- Renkema, Jan. (1993). (2004). *Discourse Studies. An Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/z.124>
- Searle, John R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in The Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173438.005>
- Searle, John R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609213.009>
- Simons, Herbert W. (1976). *Persuasion: Understanding, Practice, and Analysis*. New York: Newbery Award Records, Inc.
- Spradley, James P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980), pp. 29-30. University Press.