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Abstract
This study is aimed at revealing the speech acts implemented on Tony Abbott’s speech towards Bali Nine’s Death penalty. It is a qualitative study which implements speech acts theories. The data are collected through documentary technique. The data has revealed that there are three types of illocutionary acts realized in the speech and the representative act accounts for the largest proportion with 15 out of 22 utterances of illocutionary acts. Abbott has succeeded in telling the world about their disappointment towards the case. He was also able to make suggestions, complaint, assumptions, and conclusions as well as statement of some facts. He used directives which were delivered both in direct and indirect way trying to spur the audience to make some actions. At last, by using commissive, he also succeeded in convincing his audience about the promise and guarantee he has made.
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Abstrak
Marisatul Khasanah

Para pendengar melakukan sesuai dengan apa yang ia utarakan. Menggunakan commissive, ia pun berhasil meyakinkan mereka melalui janji-janjinya.

Kata kunci: Pragmatik, Pidato, Tindak Tutur

INTRODUCTION

Language is used to convey messages to other people (hearers or readers), to express thoughts and feelings, and to declare something to the listeners in social communication. It has been developed into important means for describing interpersonal relationships with the development of human society. Sometimes people use language in communication which aims to affect people’s feelings, thoughts, and perceptions. The speaker who is seen as the most active member of the conversation tends to tell or persuade the hearers, while they try to derive meaning from what he or she has listen from the conversation at that given occasion. Dealimg with its role in conversation, language can be used anywhere and anytime. However it depends on the situations in which it is carried out. Formal language is more usable in academic fields than casual language. However the formality does not influence the use of language in conveying the ideas and thoughts of speakers to the listeners.

Also, a language can be viewed as a mental reality. It exists in the heads of people who speak it, and we assume that language existence because of people’s capability to learn languages in general and their practice correlated with at least one particular language (Bauer, 2007: 3). But nowadays, language is not only reflecting our reality, but more important to creating reality. Our words are never neutral, they carry the power that reflects the interests of those who speak or write (Fiske, 194: 29). In other words, how the reality is designated, somehow, depends on how the speaker tells or the writer writes. It is certainly influenced by their backgrounds. Knowledge, feelings, or interests sometimes help them to decide what is in their mind in actualizing reality.
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In line with the above phenomena, linguists have been developing theories of language which can be used to make a deep understanding of text beyond the sentences. In the past, people concerned with the well-grammatical constructed sentences in communication. However, as stated by Yule (2006: 141), nowadays people concern more about how language users successfully interpret what other language users intend to convey. People are expected to understand the speaker's actual intention who communicate more than they say. Engaging to a particular language, we should not merely consider the accurate representation of the forms or structures of language. However, in fact, we are supposed to be capable of more than knowing the structures and to understand that a conditional relation exists between clauses/sentences. Besides, Yule (1996: 3) views that pragmatic is a speaker's meaning. It concerns a study of meaning uttered by a speaker and interpreted by a listener.

Furthermore, as a tool of communication, language can be manipulated to convey message. By organizing the language, people can offer, asking, declare, or showing their intended meanings. Every component of each utterance has particular communicative functions. For instance, a word functions as reference to a certain thing, place, or time which the speaker intend to. Hence, the sentence structure can influence the meaning of the utterance. Therefore, there will always a reason why the sentence/utterance is formed in such way. In other words, pragmatic study also concerns with finding the meanings when people utter a set of language.

Pragmatic, as a branch of study of language, has its own perspectives in viewing how language can be manipulated in certain way. It scopes several elements which play particular roles when a speaker is delivering the speech. So how the sentence structure works as supposed to be can be revealed by analyzing the pragmatic elements. They could be speech acts, implicatures, deictic expressions, reference, inference, politeness, etc. Yule (1996: 3) views that pragmatic is the study of speaker's meaning. It concerns a study of meaning uttered by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. Besides, he also defines pragmatic as 'contextual meaning' which involves the interpretation of what people mean in a specific context.
and how the context influences what is said. He also assumes that pragmatic is the expression of relative distance. Pragmatic is the study of meaning in relation to speech situational context in which addressee, context of utterances, goal of communication, and speech acts are compromised together as the key elements. However, it is sometimes also influenced by the cultural, social, psychological, religious, and political bounds.

Studying the language using pragmatic point of view can be applied in political discourses. Language is not only a powerful weapon in getting to the political thoughts and ideologies of politicians but also has unique purposes and functions. People can see how a president uses political language either to gain power, exercise or keep his power. A politician sometimes conveys his thoughts commenting about an actual issue without offending others. In this case, the language produced is aimed to maintain relationship with other politicians. Moreover, a candidate can use a strategy to manipulate words in suiting his intention and later to win people’s votes in a campaign. It can be said that language provides them an opportunity to explore the available resources with purpose of maintaining and sustaining their power. Those spoken texts uttered by politicians in order to convey meaning or messages used in political situation can be regarded as political speech. Through a speech, they can make the audiences understand and know about each other’s social culture, custom, idea, and background. They communicate with language and use it to express interpersonal meanings. Then, a speech becomes a multi-faceted phenomenon that can be explored from many different points of view.

A political speech is characterized by a higher degree of planning than is normal in spontaneous speech. It can be distinguished from the organization, wording, stylistic quality, sentence structure, and content of the speech. Some political speeches may be conveyed by avoiding offensive tendency. However, sometimes, a speech is delivered with the purpose of directly offend other politicians or by using interpersonal language. This interpersonal aspect becomes an interest to be investigated by linguists nowadays. That interest nowadays is gradually changing from the traditional focus on the linguistic structure of text to how
texts describe in the social process. Kaplan (1990: 329) assumes that understanding of the text does not mean understanding the grammar, morphology, semantics and phonology of a text. It cannot be simply said that one can understand what other said or write only by understanding the grammar used. S/he has to consider what, why, or how they write or speak such utterances. That is what nowadays one need to figure out from linguistics viewpoints.

When people speak, they are doing more than simply conveying information they act. In other word, every utterance conveys meaning/information and performs actions. Therefore, Yule (1996: 43) states that those actions performed via utterances are called as speech acts. It is in accordance with what has been pointed out by Cutting (2002: 16) who defines speech acts as actions which are performed via utterances.

Austin (1962) analyzes three different levels of speech acts which are formulated as locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. These classifications are based on the fact that speech acts arise from an utterance that is followed by other utterances as a response toward the previous utterance and finally causes an effect. The classifications include Locutionary Act that is called by the act of saying something, Illocutionary Act that is intention behind the words that are uttered by the speaker and Perlocutionary act that is the effect of the illocution on the hearer.

Since speech act represents the speaker’s behavior, the utterance must have a meaning. In other types, speech acts can be categorized in two groups: direct speech act when intended meaning is the same as its literal meaning, and indirect speech act when the intended meaning is different from its literal meaning. Searle in Cutting (2002: 19) states that a direct speech act is employed when the speaker is going to communicate the literal meaning that the words semantically express. There is a direct relationship between the form and the function in the speech act, for instance, a declarative form functions as a declaration of something. On the other hand, an indirect speech act is used when the speaker wants to speak a different meaning from the obvious meaning. Here the form is not directly related to the function, for instance, a declarative form functions as request or order; an interrogative form can function as a
request, an order, or an offer; and an imperative can function as a statement, an offer, or an invitation. In addition, Yule in Cutting (2002) states that whenever there is a direct relationship between structure and function, we have a direct speech act. Whenever there is an indirect correlation between structure and function, we are using an indirect speech act. A declarative employed to state is a direct speech act, but declarative in a request is an indirect speech act.

Speech acts cannot be separated from pragmatic. According to Fairclough (1989: 83), speech acts are the central aspects of pragmatic, which is concerned with the meanings. Searle (1969) in Yule (1996: 53) divides the functions of speech acts into five categories. They are:

Representatives: these speech acts carry the values 'true' or 'false', i.e., they commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition such as asserting, reporting, instructing, concluding, etc. Directives: the speaker's role is to get (to direct) the hearer to do something (or towards some goal). Commissives: Searle calls them ‘unexceptionable’, i.e. the obligation created in the word by commissives is created in the speaker not in the hearer. So they commit the speaker to some future action, such as offering, threatening, promising, etc. Expressives: these express an inner state of the speaker. They tend to be intrinsically polite as in greeting, thanking, congratulating, etc.; and the reverse is true as in blaming and accusing. Declaratives: these show the correspondence between the prepositional content and reality and as Searle calls 'a very special category of speech acts', such as resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, sentencing, etc.

Some studies have been conducted to analyze speeches from pragmatic viewpoint. Quinto (2014) conducted a study exploring how the President of the Philippines, Benigno Simeon Aquino III, or simply PNoy, set up the deictic field by using several personal, spatial, temporal, and social deictic expressions. The arrangement of those deictic expression created a deictic field in which the Filipino
people were situated at a deictic center and the President and his critics were in binary opposition. This study also found that PNoy’s deployment of deictic expressions was very effectively done so that the deictic center was persuaded to judge the president and his government favorably and the binary opposite in the deictic field, unfavorably. Through a systematic stylistic deixis in political speech, this study concluded that not only personal deixis, but also temporal, spatial and social deixis helped political actors to persuade the audience in their favor and ultimately boost their power both in political discourse and outside.

Josiah and Johnson (2012) conducted pragmatic analyses of President Goodluck Jonathan’s and President Barack Obama’s Inaugural Addresses. It analyzed the first inaugural presidential speeches: Nigeria’s Goodluck Ebele Jonathan (2011) and America’s Barrack Obama (2009). The study investigated the illocutionary forces as well as the face-threatening and face-saving acts in the speeches, with the purpose of identifying the similarities and differences of those speeches. Based on the result of this study, it can be said that the speeches were relatively alike because each speaker spoke for his entire nation, regardless of his political party. Both speeches showed a preponderance of ‘representatives’ and ‘commissives’. In addition, the commissives that President Jonathan’s showed predominance in the use of modal verbs to express intention, while President Obama’s commissives consisted of modal verbs and infinitive clauses to project volition and intention. However, this study lacks of the explanation in terms of significance correlation between the two pragmatic elements used in analyzing the data.

Based on those previous studies, it can be concluded that speech can be an object of linguistic studies. The prior studies focus on the pragmatic analysis such as indexicality, speech acts and politeness strategies. Actually they have similar field with this study. However, none has analyzed the speech using speech acts theories. The following is the speech analyzed in this study.

“We will be making our displeasure known, we will be letting Indonesia know in absolutely unambiguous terms that we feel grievously let down. Let’s not forget that a few years ago when Indonesia was struck by the Indian Ocean tsunami
Australia sent a billion dollars worth of assistance, we sent a significant contingent of our armed forces to help in Indonesia with humanitarian relief and Australians lost their lives in that campaign to help Indonesia. And I would say to the Indonesian people and the Indonesian government: we in Australia are always there to help you and we hope that you might reciprocate in this way at this time. I don’t want to prejudice the best possible relations with a very important friend and neighbor but I’ve got to say that we can’t just ignore this kind of thing if the perfectly reasonable representations we are making to Indonesia are ignored by them. We are doing no more for our citizens than Indonesia routinely does for its own citizens and if it’s right and proper for Indonesia to make these representations, if it’s right and proper for other countries to heed Indonesia’s representations, it’s right and proper for us to make the representations and for them to be heeded. In fact, they have become, it seems, thoroughly reformed characters in prison in Bali and they are now helping the Indonesian fight against drug crime, so much better to use these people for good than to kill them.”

The speech was chosen since it became a hot issue by the time it was delivered. This speech became controversy as Abbott described Indonesia as ungrateful for refusing to make its decision to sentence two Australian drug traffickers despite A$1 billion worth of aid given to Aceh when Tsunami hit it in 2004. This is interesting to analyze how Abbott, as the Australian representative, express his anger and strong desire due to Indonesia’s persistence ignorance. Using the above concepts, this study revealed how he realized his intended meaning which was influenced by his believe and attitude regarding the death sentence as he showed in his speech. Moreover, as the speech went viral through mass media that could be accessed by many people around the world. This study was conducted in order to explain the indexicality realized in Tony Abbott’s speech, the general functions of speech acts employed in Tony Abbott’s speech,
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the politeness strategies employed by the speaker and the intended meaning of Tony Abbott’s speech.

This study employed speech acts as an element of pragmatic to analyze the speech delivered by Tony Abbott on February 18th 2015. The theory was used to describe the general functions of speech acts of the utterances. The data collection used in this study was documentary technique. To analyze the data, the procedures proposed by Miles et al. (2014: 7) was considered to be employed with the following steps: (1) data condensation; (2) data display; (3) conclusion drawing and verification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A conversation will always incorporates two parties (speaker and hearer/audience), in which each of them plays a vital role. The speaker seen as an active member of the conversation tend to inform, influence and persuade the listeners, while they try to derive meaning from what he or she has encoded from the conversation on that given occasion. This is to say that meaning is derived based on a particular situation and context of speech. In other words, utterances made within a context influence meaning. Therefore, oratory must include issues in which the meaning can be derived and must have an effect on the audience.

This study also aimed to reveal the type and realization of speech acts used by Tony Abbott, as the speaker, in carrying his intended messages dealing with the death penalty issue and how he used it to persuade and influence his audience. The data of this study is a speech published in the media and on the Internet. The speech has been made based on the number of sentences found in the publication before analysis. The categorization of the utterances as presented in the analysis follows the illocutionary force into speech acts. It is classified into five stages by Searle (1975). This following table serves as the basis for the discussion in the research work.
Table 1. Findings on Speech Acts Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Illocutionary Act</th>
<th>Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Well, we will be making our displeasure known (U1S3)</td>
<td>The speaker promised that their feeling of displeasure would be known by Indonesia.</td>
<td>Direct Commissive (promising – to Australian; Threatening – to Indonesia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>we will be letting Indonesia know in absolutely unambiguous terms (U2S3)</td>
<td>The speaker promised and did believe that Indonesia would certainly know their feeling of displeasure because what he was going to say was completely clear and unambiguous.</td>
<td>Direct Commissive (guaranteeing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>that we feel grievously let down (U3S1)</td>
<td>The speaker stated and strengthened the deep disappointment that he and all Australians felt. He hoped that Indonesia would take this disappointment into their consideration.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (complaining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Let’s not forget (U4S2)</td>
<td>The speaker wanted the addressees not to forget and instead to remember about something.</td>
<td>Direct Directive (requesting/inviting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>that a few years ago when Indonesia was struck by the Indian Ocean tsunami Australia sent a billion dollars worth of assistance (U5S1)</td>
<td>The speaker stated and was likely to stress out the meaning of assistance his country had given to Indonesia in the past years.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (stating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>we sent a significant contingent of our armed forces to help in Indonesia with humanitarian relief (U6S1)</td>
<td>The speaker asserted about the contingent sent to help Indonesia in humanitarian relief.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (stating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>and Australians lost their lives in that campaign to help Indonesia (U7S2)</td>
<td>The speaker strengthened the previous statement by confirming that they had to pay with a precious price (their lives) for being involved in the campaign in helping Indonesia. He wanted Indonesia to pay their debt by sparing the Bali Nine’s lives.</td>
<td>Indirect Directive (requesting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>And I would</td>
<td>The speaker asked</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say to the Indonesian people and the Indonesian government (U8S2)</td>
<td>Indonesian people and the Indonesian government to take his following statements into their consideration.</td>
<td>Directive (requesting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>we in Australia are always there to help you (U9S3)</td>
<td>The speaker committed that people in Australia along with their government are always be able to be counted on either in good or bad times for Indonesia.</td>
<td>Direct Commissive (guaranteeing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>and we hope that you might reciprocate in this way at this time (U10S2)</td>
<td>The speaker asked Indonesia to reciprocate immediately regarding the help that they have enlisted from Australia by sparing the lives of Bali Nine pair.</td>
<td>Indirect Directive (requesting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Well, I don’t want to prejudice the best possible relations with a very important friend and neighbor (U11S1)</td>
<td>The speaker stated that he did not want to make any prejudice and instead underscoring the importance of Australia’s relationship with Indonesia.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (stating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>but I’ve got to say (U12S1)</td>
<td>The speaker stated that he had to say something crucial in</td>
<td>Direct Representative (stating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>that we can’t just ignore this kind of thing (U13S1)</td>
<td>contrary with the previous statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The speaker suggested not to just ignore their disappointment despite of the close relationship with Indonesia.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (suggesting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>if the perfectly reasonable representations we are making to Indonesia are ignored by them (U14S1)</td>
<td>The speaker assumed that Indonesia ignored the representations they were making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Representative (assuming)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>We are doing no more for our citizens than Indonesia routinely does for its own citizens (U15S1)</td>
<td>The speaker stated the effort that have been made by his country compared to the ones routinely made by Indonesia (in case of protecting its citizens from being subjected to judicial execution in other countries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Representative (stating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>and if it’s right and proper for Indonesia to make these representations (U16S1)</td>
<td>The speaker assumed that it was right and proper for Indonesia to make representations for helping and protecting its citizens overseas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Representative (assuming)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>if it's right and proper for other countries to heed Indonesia’s representations (U17S1)</td>
<td>The speaker also assumed that it was right and also proper for other countries to respond and heed Indonesia’s representations.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (assuming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>it’s right and proper for us to make the representations (U18S1)</td>
<td>The speaker concluded that Australia also had the same right to make representations as what Indonesia has made.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (concluding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>and for them to be heeded (U19S1)</td>
<td>The speaker concluded that the representations that have been made by Australia must have also been heeded by Indonesia.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (concluding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>In fact, they have become, it seems, thoroughly reformed characters in prison in Bali (U20S1)</td>
<td>The speaker stated the fact about the thorough-characters-transformation of the Bali Nine pair while they spent a decade in prison.</td>
<td>Direct Representative (stating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>and they are now helping the Indonesian fight against drug crime (U21S1)</td>
<td>The speaker added an information for his preceding statement that the pair has been helping Indonesia in drug fighting campaign</td>
<td>Direct Representative (stating)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data has revealed that there are only three types of illocutionary acts realized in the speech and the representative act accounts for the largest proportion with 15 out of 22 utterances of illocutionary acts performed in the analysis.

The excessive use of representative denotes several usages including complaining, stating, suggesting, assuming, and concluding. As in [U3] when Abbott said, “that we feel grievously let down”, his representative speech act comprises of complain. Abbott, as the Australians’ representative, deliberately wanted to express and show the Australians’ deep disappointment. This is proved by employing two emotive lexicons placed side by side: ‘grievously’ (adv.) and ‘let down’ (noun). The choice of an adverb ‘grievously’ has, of course, a reason, instead of selecting the other adverbs of manner, such as completely, deeply and very. Abbot’s choice went to ‘grievously’ which is not only to indicate degree but emotive feelings, as well. ‘Grievously’ indicates the pain, which is the same as ‘being let down’. The omission of ‘grievously’ is actually possible, as ‘being let down’ already means sad and pain. However, to strengthen his point, ‘grievously’ which meaning emotionally is similar to ‘being let down’ was chosen. ‘Grievously let down’ moreover gives significance that the disappointment felt by Australian is indeed there.

The highest frequency for representatives in this speech covers the statement of fact, respectively. For example as presented by [U5] and [U6].
that a few years ago when Indonesia was struck by the
Indian Ocean tsunami Australia sent a billion dollars
worth of assistance

we sent a significant contingent of our armed forces to
help in Indonesia with humanitarian relief

In those utterances Abbott intentionally reminded his audiences,
purposefully intended for the Indonesians, about the past event
when the natural disaster struck Indonesia. Likewise, he stated and
was likely to stress out the meaning of assistance his country had
given to Indonesia. He used a noun ‘worth’ followed by ‘a significant
contingent’, which is absolutely long-winded or verbose. The other
examples of Abbott’s statements of fact can be seen in [U20] and
[U21]. These statements are about the reformed characters of Bali
Nine pair during their life behind bars in Bali. They were said to take
part in Indonesia’s fight against drug.

In fact, they have become, it seems, thoroughly
reformed characters in prison in Bali

and they are now helping the Indonesian fight against
drug crime

so much better to use these people for good than to kill them

So, in his following representative utterance, [U22], Abbott suggested
to spare this pair’s lives and take the benefit of their character
transformation in the effort of fighting against drug abuse.

Directives follow with 4 utterances out of 22. One of those is
direct speech acts functioning as a request or invitation and the
others are indirect speech acts which also have similar functions. The
direct speech act as in [U4] marks the direct relationship between the
utterance’s structure and its function.

Let’s not forget

Indeed, when Abbott uttered it, he made an imperative sentence
functions as request. This means to reiterate a reminder. In the other
hand, Abbott also produced declaratives used to make requests. As
presented in [U7], [U8] and [U10].

and Australians lost their lives in that campaign to
help Indonesia
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[U8] And I would say to the Indonesian people and the Indonesian government
[U10] and we hope that you might reciprocate in this way at this time

Because of the indirect relationship between their structure and function, so those utterances considered as indirect speech acts. For example, when Abbott uttered [U7], he did not merely give a statement. Basically, when [U7] is paraphrased as in [U7a.], it is used to make a statement. And undeniably, it is functioning as a direct speech acts. But when it is related to its context, the analysis goes beyond than just a simple statement. As paraphrased in [U7b.], the utterance is used to make a request and functioning as an indirect speech acts.

[U7] a. I (the speaker) tell you about the lost
    b. I (the speaker) ask you pay the lost back

So, in other words, by uttering such type of speech acts, Abbott sought to remind the Indonesian people of the Australian lives lost helping Indonesians cope with the natural disaster. This marks the Australian government’s strongest response to the planned executions to date.

Finally, commissives come next with 3 out of 22 utterances. The commissives in the speech comprise promise as well as guarantees and threats. The use commissives found in [U1], [U2] and [U9].

[U1] Well, we will be making our displeasure known
[U2] we will be letting Indonesia know in absolutely unambiguous terms
[U9] we in Australia are always there to help you

In [U1] and [U2], the commissives performs diverse functions based on the addressees. At first, those utterances were meant to be addressed for Australians. For them, who belong to a same ‘collective group’, the utterances mean a promise and a guarantee that their feeling of displeasure will be known by Indonesia. Moreover, by using ‘absolutely’ (adverb) and ‘unambiguous’ (adjective) as an adverb of manner, Abbott did believe about what he was going to say which was completely clear and unambiguous. But, when those utterances intentionally addressed for Indonesia, they sounds like a
threat. Apparently they intimidated the addressees if they were ignored and what the speaker’s wants were disregarded. Besides, there would also be a number of consequences entailed if the ignorance happened (the executions go ahead). Talking about Indonesia as the addressee, the commissive in [U9] performed as a guarantee. In this utterance, by using deictic projection, Abbott tried to convince his addressee that they, in Australia, have been being supportive to Indonesia through the time. The choice of word ‘always’ makes it as a guarantee. Thus, this utterance simply means Australia are available to provide help and support for Indonesia anytime when they are needed.

Abbotts’ speech is mainly about requesting. He delivered his request by preceding it with several statements as well as arguments which strengthened and gave fundamental reasons why his representation ought to be heeded at that time. These fundamental reasons later would lead the addressee to his speech main purpose. One of the evidence of this process can be seen when he uttered the following representative utterances.

[U15] We are doing no more for our citizens than Indonesia routinely does for its own citizens
[U16] and if it’s right and proper for Indonesia to make these representations
[U17] if it’s right and proper for other countries to heed Indonesia’s representations
[U18] it’s right and proper for us to make the representations
[U19] and for them to be heeded

In those utterances Abbott delivered his argumentation by asserting a statement as in [U15] which later followed by arguments as in [U16] and [U17]. Those statement and arguments are purposefully uttered to strengthen and emphasize his concluding remarks in [U18] and [U19].

Associated with the context, what he meant is if it is right and proper for Indonesia to make representations for helping and protecting its citizens from being subjected to judicial execution in other countries (as what President Joko Widodo had explained in his interview with Aljazeera). And if it is right and also proper for other
countries to heed Indonesia’s representations. Therefore, Australia also has the same right to make representations, in asking clemency for its citizens subjected in Indonesia, as what it has made through that time. And thus, those representations that have been made by Australia must have also been heeded by Indonesia. In the other words, Abbott urged Indonesia to respond to his request as the same way it expects for immediate response from other countries.

Furthermore, Abbott central speech act as in [U10] which labelled as request based on its speech function, does not correspond to its form. This utterance is delivered in indirect way since it appears in declarative form but has communicative function as request. One of the reason why Abbott employed his request in such way is based on the politeness strategies. He might considered that an indirect speech act was more appropriate to be used. He did it to show politeness considering his position and the relationship between Indonesia and Australia. Regarding this, Abbott’s utterance in [U10] which functions as request is deliberately seen as an imposition by him on his hearer, as he assumed that the hearer was able to perform and had a social obligation to comply the action he asked. Therefore it would be better for him as the speaker to avoid a direct imposition through the use of indirect speech act to lessen the possible threat on his hearer’s face. In this case, we can say that the indirect speech acts produced in this speech are associated with politeness within its environment. It supports the theory proposed by Brown & Levinson as the theory assumes that requests, offers, compliments, or other speech acts inherently threaten both the hearer’s and the speaker’s face-wants, and that politeness is used in redressing the face threatening acts.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of speech acts shows that Abbott, as the speaker, made use only three stages of the illocutionary acts to convey his message to his audience clearly. Through the excessive use of the representatives of the illocutionary acts by the speaker, it can be said that the speaker has succeeded in telling the world about their disappointment towards the case. He was also able to make suggestions, complaint, assumptions, and conclusions as well as
statement of some facts. Also, surrounded by requesting speech event, Abbott also used directives which were delivered both in direct and indirect way trying to spur the audience to make some actions. And at last, by using commissive, he also succeeded in convincing his audience about the promise and guarantee he has made.
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