

## COMMISSIVE ACTS TYPES OF UTTERANCES IN “SENIOR YEAR” MOVIE

**Fanny Virginia**

Sastra Inggris

Universitas Putera Batam

[fanvirginia10@gmail.com](mailto:fanvirginia10@gmail.com)

**Ambalegin Ambalegin**

Sastra Inggris

Universitas Putera Batam

[Ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id](mailto:Ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id)

### Article History

Received:  
21-09-2022

Revised:  
20-11-2022

Accepted:  
25-11-2022

**Abstract.** Movie becomes one of the increasingly popular informative media that has pragmatics phenomena. The phenomena exist in the situation that involves speaker, interlocutor, and context as pragmatics elements. Through a pragmatic perspective, this descriptive qualitative research revealed the types of commissive acts in utterances. This research took newly released movie entitled “Senior Year” as the data source. Data were all collected from characters’ commissive utterances by using observational method and technique of non-participatory. For the data analysis, the researcher applied pragmatic identity method and pragmatic competence- in equalizing technique. Commissive acts theory discovered Searle and Vanderveken was used as the main theory to analyze data. As a result, this research confirmed there were 62 commissive utterances delivered by the movie characters in “Senior Year” movie. The utterances were found in five different types of commissive acts. Specifically, 17 data were identified as accept, threaten had nine data, promise showed nine data, 16 data were found in offer, and refuse got 11 data. The dominant type belonged to accept as it was revealed to have the highest amount of data. Also, the movie characters frequently committed themselves by accepting the offers from other characters.

**Keywords:** commissive acts, illocutionary acts, speech acts

### INTRODUCTION

Every interlocutor is undoubtedly expected to have meaning interpretation ability because one word can have multiple meanings. Having that ability enables a speaker to interpret meaning based on the speaker’s purpose in mind. This also assists the speaker and interlocutor to achieve the goal of speaking. A speaker and hearer have to know the unstated meaning in order to achieve the purpose of speaking (Virginia & Ambalegin, 2021). Paltridge (in Pradipta & Sugiharti, 2022) in communication, meaning can’t be separated by particular context, conversation stage, and cultural phenomena. Among other linguistics branches, pragmatics is the one that focuses on the speaker meaning of an utterance. The study that discovers its meaning through context is pragmatics (Birner, 2013). Pragmatically, there are several topics of the study and the topics obviously require context to reveal the implied meaning.

Phenomena of pragmatics have spread widely and exist in informative media. The media has YouTube as the platform, which provides information and entertainment for its users. The researcher discovered the YouTube video with the title “Adele Explains

Why She Disappears after Each Album | The Graham Norton Show” has the pragmatics phenomenon. The video was published by The Graham Norton Show on February, 22th 2022, and has reached more than 1M views. Graham Norton featured as the host and a famous singer named Adele appeared as the guest star. In the video, Adele explained the emotional and mental toll it took to create an album as the guest star used to vanish after releasing her albums. Following is the pragmatics phenomenon occurred on the video.

Norton earlier made a joke about Adele’s behavior in which she used to disappear after having her albums released. Afterward, Adele laughed at his joke and tried to clarify everything that Norton had mentioned at the beginning of the talk show.

Adele : “Umm...Well, I definitely will vanish again, but I’m trying to like make a... really conscious effort to stop being so anal with my privacy like I wouldn’t say that I’m still... private I’m trying to not always be two completely different versions of myself...”

Norton : [Nodding while listening to Adele’s answer] (00:19--> 01:30)

The conversation was produced at The Graham Norton Show studio. Besides Adele (speaker) and Norton (interlocutor), there were also several guests. However, Adele was the one that was interviewed in the video. Through the utterance above, the speaker conveyed it by also involving the speaker’s purpose in mind. The speaker declared her commitment regarding future action and the commitment was about the action that the speaker would do during her vanish. The speaker said that she was trying to make a decision that was made deliberately by having the speaker to pay full attention to it. In this case, the speaker made a promise to the interlocutor and all of her lovers. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) confirmed that the commissive acts type that is delivered to show the speaker’s obligation and benefit for hearer is promise. It confirms that the utterance above has the pragmatics phenomenon, which is specifically commissive acts of promise.

In addition to YouTube, movie is also an informative media that provides pragmatics phenomena. Nowadays, movie doubtlessly has reached large numbers of audiences as it tells various kinds of story. Characters and setting of movie also benefit the involvement of pragmatics elements in movie. The presence of pragmatics elements then leads to the phenomena existence and this infers that movie is suitable to be used as data source of pragmatics research. Movie conversation has speaker and hearer as communication partners and there is context in every conversation. Those pragmatics elements are used to reveal the unstated meaning of utterances. In this research, the researcher took “Senior Year” movie as the data source considering the movie was investigated to have commissive utterances. The utterances were conveyed to show the speakers’ commitment regarding future action. The movie portrays Stephanie as a 37-year-old woman who wakes from her 20-year coma and the woman is ready to get her diploma by finishing her senior year. One of the commissive utterances in the movie is as displayed below.

Stephanie was sitting in her bedroom while being accompanied by her father named Chris Parnell. At that time, her father did not understand the correct way of recording her daughter, which got her daughter to teach him.

Stephanie : “Okay, yeah, Dad, just press the circle. Just once. Just press it...”

Chris : “Okay, wait.”

Stephanie : “Tell me when we're going.” (00:00:24--> 00:00:30)

Stephanie (speaker) delivered the utterance above to ask Chris Parnell (interlocutor)'s help for setting up the speaker's Instagram live. The speaker was preparing herself to do the Instagram live as the speaker wanted to clear up something to her followers. The speaker also gave instructions to the interlocutor about the ways of starting Instagram live. The speaker asked him to press the circle once to begin it. Then, the interlocutor accepted the instruction by saying "okay" as an indication that showed the interlocutor committed to do the action. In conformity with Searle and Vanderveken (1985), commissive acts of accept is the type that someone says to show acceptance of future action. Hence, the interlocutor performed commissive acts of accept to show the interlocutor's commitment of future action.

In accordance with the phenomena above, it infers that speakers convey commissive acts when the utterance is about commitment for future action. Searle (1979) defined commissive acts as the classification of illocutionary acts that a speaker conveys to show that the speaker commits himself to do action in the future. Simply put, this classification is the act that involves future action. Black (2006) believed that commissive acts refers to act that commits the speaker to some future action. This indicates that a speaker produces commitment of future action by performing commissive acts.

As differentiated by Searle and Vanderveken (1985), the types of commissive acts are promise, offer, threaten, accept, and refuse. The first type is promise, which is said to show that the speaker commits to do or not do a particular future action. The speaker that performs this type is sincere to the action and this type has obligation that a speaker should do. The commissive acts type that is delivered to show the speaker's obligation and benefit for hearer is promise (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). Considering the speaker has shown his commitment to the future action, the speaker should do it in the future. Commissive acts of promise was produced in "I'll always stand with the heroes of law enforcement and I'm deeply honored to have gotten all of those endorsements..." (Gea & Johan, 2020).

The second type is offer and in offering, a speaker attempts to give an offer about future action to an interlocutor. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) claimed that this type is said to show the promise that relies on the interlocutor. Simply put, this type is about the interlocutor's refusal or acceptance. This also implies that the offering offered by a speaker is not always accepted to be done in the future as it can be refused. One of the utterances is as seen in "Our vision is "Indonesia Maju", we offer an optimistic and the fairness of Indonesia in the future" (Husain et al., 2020).

The third type refers to threaten and a speaker uses this type of commissive acts to show the speaker's commitment for future action. Specifically, there is no any promise in this type, which infers that the future action is not promised to be done. This type does not have benefit for the interlocutor and the nonexistence of promise makes this type is categorized as independent. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) clarified threaten as the type that has no obligation and benefit for interlocutor. Therefore, utterance of this type involves threat about future action. The utterance of threaten is "How dare you believe in him before I have given you permission?..." (Istiqomah & Ibrohim, 2020).

The fourth commissive acts type is refuse. This type is conveyed to reject someone's offer. It is the contradiction of accept because whenever a speaker does not want to do a particular future action, this type is delivered. Refuse is dissimilar to accept and said if the speaker refuses an offer (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). Every refusal is done if there has the chance for the speaker to choose between accepting and refusing as the

speaker's commitment. An utterance that refers to refuse is as in "Not 'ours' book, but my book" (Devi & Degaf, 2021).

The last is accept and unlike refuse, accept is conveyed to show that a speaker commits to do a future action. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) argued that commissive acts of accept is the type that someone says to show acceptance of future action. Hence, the communication partner is allowed to do every action that has been approved to be accomplished. The utterance that shows accept is as displayed in the utterance of "Oh yeah! We don't have any plan" (Desica & Ambalegin, 2022).

Several previous researchers have explored the topic of commissive acts types due to the importance of understanding commissive acts. In this section, two previous research were provided as comparisons and references for present research. Devi and Degaf (2021) determined the commissive acts types in "Knives Out" movie in the research. By taking the theory of Searle and Vanderveken (1985), the research found there were 13 data and six commissive acts types in the main character's utterances. Volunteer, guarantee, offer, threat, and promise had two data for each type and three data were found in refuse. It revealed that the main character frequently uttered utterances that showed rejection.

Identifying commissive acts types in "Fatherhood" movie became the aim of Caniago and Afriana (2022)'s research. The data were all from commissive utterances conveyed by the movie characters. The data analysis was done by using the theory of Searle and Vanderveken (1985). It was reported that six types appeared in the movie and there were 15 data. Six data referred to offer, one data of refuse and volunteer, guarantee, promise, and threaten got two data for each type. Offering was revealed as the most dominant volunteer was the least delivered type.

There have several similarities and differences between present and previous research. For the similarities, the previous and present research analyzed the same object and it was examined by applying the same theory. The research differences appeared in data source because none of the research took the same data source as this present research. "Senior Year" movie was chosen as the data source considering the movie has the commissive acts phenomena and never been examined in the same field. The commissive acts in the movie also influenced the story line because the characters showed commitment of future action in the movie. This infers that different data source became the novelty of previous and present research. In addition to different data source, this research also did not only find out the commissive acts types in utterances. The analysis was done by requiring the researcher to interpret and describe the context. The movie characters' ways of performing commissive acts were also explained to give clear analysis. This research's results are hoped to provide detailed understanding of commissive acts phenomena in the "Senior Year" movie. Conclusively, this present research aimed at revealing the types of commissive acts in "Senior Year" movie.

## **METHOD**

The researcher designed this research as descriptive qualitative research. By being designed the same, it indicates that this research referred to descriptive qualitative research. This research was specifically conducted to investigate commissive acts types as the research object. The types were discovered by firstly revealing the speakers' intention regarding commitment of future action. Leavy (2017) argued that the characteristics of qualitative research are having social phenomenon as the object, involving better understanding through the analysis, and purposing at finding out meaning. In other words, qualitative research reveals the phenomenon in society, give

the clear understanding, and aim at revealing meaning.

Observational method was used to collect data and it was specifically done by taking non-participatory technique based on Sudaryanto (2015)'s theories. The data collection was done through researcher's observation and the researcher did not participate in the data source. Several steps were followed by the researcher. Firstly, the movie directed by Hardcastle (2022) entitled "Senior Year" movie was watched to ensure the data source suitability. After selecting the movie as data source, the researcher re-watched the movie by listening to the utterances and looking at context of all utterances. In the third step, the researcher put the main concern on the conversations that have the characteristics of commissive acts phenomena. Then, the researcher directly typed the conversations. Lastly, all utterances that have commissive acts phenomena in the conversations were marked as bold.

The researcher continued the process by analyzing data. Pragmatic identity method and pragmatic competence- in equalizing technique from Sudaryanto (2015) was adopted. In each analysis, pragmatics elements were included to reveal the unspoken meaning and all collected data could trigger the interlocutor. The analysis process had the researcher to equalize the data with Searle and Vanderveken (1985)'s theory. Similar to the data collection, data analysis also have some steps to follow. Firstly, context interpretation of the bold utterances was done to have the implied meaning. The meaning then became the data that would be equalized with the theory. Secondly, the researcher applied the technique of data analysis by equalizing the data and theory to find out the types. Thirdly, the research result confirmed the types of commissive acts in "Senior Year" movie.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### A. Frequency of Commissive Act Types in *Senior Year* Movie

Through this research, the researcher revealed that there had 62 data of commissive acts in the "Senior Year" movie. 17 data were found in commissive acts of accept, 16 data were performed in commissive acts of offer, nine data were found in promise and threaten, and refuse got 11 data in total. Regarding the dominant type, it belonged to commissive acts of accept because this type were uttered in 17 utterances. Also, the characters commonly showed their commitment to future action by accepting the offers uttered by other characters. The total data is presented in the table 1.

**Table 1.** Commissive acts types in "Senior Year" movie

No.	Commissive Acts Types	Frequency
1.	Promise	9
2.	Offer	16
3.	Threaten	9
4.	Refuse	11
5.	Accept	17
	<b>Overall Amount</b>	62

## B. Types of Commissive Acts in *Senior Year* Movie

For data redundancy avoidance, 62 data were reduced to 15 data analyses. Data reduction assisted the researchers to display the best data that could fully represent the relevant phenomena. In reducing data, the researchers implemented the data reduction method invented by Sugiyono (2013). In order to give a clear description and optimize the process, researchers summarize, select the important elements, are concerned about the point, and find the pattern (Sugiyono, 2013). The selected data consist of the analysis of commissive acts types, namely accept, threaten, refuse, promise and offer. Firstly, the researchers took three data for acceptance in data 3, 6, and 15. Secondly, one data of threat was taken to be displayed in data 7. Thirdly, four data of refuse were discussed in data 4, 10, 12, and 14. Fourthly, four data of promise were presented in data 5, 8, 9, and 13. Lastly, three data for the offer were analyzed in data 1, 2, and 11. Furthermore, all of those data were discussed by implementing the applied research methodology and the theory of Searle and Vanderveken (1985). Data were naturally presented based on the duration of “Senior Year” movie and each piece of data has the involvement of pragmatics elements. The researchers also provided descriptions that triggered the conversation’s production. The discussions of commissive acts types produced in “Senior Year” movie are as follows.

### *Data 1*

Stephanie was celebrating her birthday at Rockin’ Ball Club with her friends. At that moment, Stephanie and Deanna Russo were playing bowling when one of their friends made them laugh.

Russo : “Steph, you do one.”

Stephanie : [excitedly going to take bowling ball] (00:01:31-->00:01:33)

Russo (speaker) talked about the commitment of future action in which the speaker asked Stephanie (interlocutor) to play bowling. By saying the utterance, the speaker offered the interlocutor to play that game in the interlocutor’s birthday party. The interlocutor seemed excited as she was given the chance to try. It indicates that the speaker had the intention to offer the interlocutor to do a future action. The action could be refused or accepted by the intention and the offer was accepted. The analysis confirms that commissive acts of offer is involved because there had an offer given to the interlocutor.

### *Data 2*

After playing bowling, Stephanie approached Blaine and Tiffany. They were standing in front of the birthday girl named Stephanie. She came to invite them to join the party at the club.

Stephanie : “Sup, Blaine.”

Tiffany : “Hey, Tiffany.”

Stefanie : “I’m having a birthday party, if you guys wanna join.”

Tiffany : “Cute that in Australia you call it a party, 'cause in America, we call that a freak show.” (00:01:54-->00:02:09)

This conversation still took place at the Rockin’ Ball Club in which Stephanie (speaker) and Tiffany (interlocutor) involved. The speaker came to offer the interlocutor to join the party as the birthday party was being held. In this case, an offer was given to the interlocutor without forcing, which means that the interlocutor could refuse and accept the future action. The speaker offered that action by offering them to be in her birthday party. The offer then got a rejection from the interlocutor as she insulted the

party. Therefore, this implies that the speaker applied commissive acts of offer.

#### *Data 3*

Stephanie earlier took picture of herself as she believed that she looked good on her cheerleader uniform. The girl was getting ready to school, but she had not gone down stairs. It then triggered Chris Parnell to call her to leave her bedroom.

Parnell : “Steph! Seth is here!”

Stephanie : “Uh, yep, yep. Coming, coming.” (00:03:40 -->00:03:44)

Parnell (speaker) was not at Stephanie (interlocutor)’s bedroom. The speaker was downstairs to prepare for the interlocutor’s breakfast. As the interlocutor had not gone down, the speaker shouted at her to inform that her friend had arrived. The speaker said that Seth was there and the speaker wanted her to be there as well. The interlocutor then answered by accepting to do so by saying “yep, yep” to the speaker. Through the utterance, the interlocutor showed her acceptance of the future action. The action required her to go down and meet Seth. Therefore, it describes that the commissive acts in the utterance refers to commissive acts accept.

#### *Data 4*

Stephanie went downstairs as Chris Parnell told Stephanie that Seth was in the dining room. In the dining room, the man had prepared breakfast for her daughter. There was also Seth, who was enjoying his breakfast there while waiting for Stephanie.

Stephanie : “Um, can we actually rain check? I'm on a diet of only bananas and ice cubes till prom.”

Chris : “Oh! Speaking of...” (00:04:34 -->00:04:41)

Stephanie (speaker) previously informed Parnell (interlocutor) to not cook breakfast for her. The speaker said it after seeing lots of food on the dining table. The speaker used the utterance to show her refusal of having breakfast. At that time, the speaker refused by saying she was on diet and she only ate ice cubes and bananas until prom night. From the utterance, it emphasizes that there is the intention of refusing a future action. The speaker committed to not have the food prepared because she did not want to gain weight. Thus, commissive acts of refuse was applied in the utterance.

#### *Data 5*

Seth earlier said that Parnell was cool and it might be a sad woman that wanted to date Chris Parnell. After hearing that statement, Parnell delivered utterance below in the dining room.

Chris : “I'll tell you what... I'll ask somebody out when you do, Seth.”

Seth : “Yeah.” (00:05:28-->00:05:33)

Parnell (speaker) talked to Seth (interlocutor) while waiting for Stephanie to get ready. The conversation was said at the dining room. The speaker responded to the interlocutor’s previous utterance in which he was asked to find a woman. It led the speaker to say that the speaker would find a woman if the interlocutor did it. As seen in the utterance, the speaker committed to do so by promising. This action indeed would benefit the interlocutor as it was in accordance with the interlocutor’s desire. It clarifies that the speaker conveyed the commissive acts of promise to show his commitment.

#### *Data 6*

In the car, Stephanie offered Seth to come to after-prom party. The girl really wanted him to be there and the excitement of the girl was clearly shown while she was talking.

Stephanie : “Oh, also, there's gonna be a VIP room and you're totally gonna be on

the list. I mean it.”

Seth : “Fun.” (00:07:28 -->00:07:33)

Stephanie (speaker) produced the utterance above to talk about her planning for the party. The speaker wanted Seth (interlocutor) to join the party and the interlocutor was also informed that he would have a VIP room. The speaker added that his name would be on the list and she was very sure about it. After hearing it, the interlocutor was shocked by the statement. The interlocutor did not expect to have a VIP room at the speaker’s after-prom party and the offer got an acceptance by the interlocutor through the word “fun”. The interlocutor committed to be at the party and VIP room. In line with the analysis, it highlights that there has the performance of commissive acts of accept.

*Data 7*

Stephanie seemed very happy because of the acceptance while the boy wiping bleed in his forehead that suddenly came out during their way to school. Afterwards, the girl planned to go out from her car as they had arrived at school.

Stephanie : “Okay, um, I’m gonna let you out here because I got to make my entrance...”

Seth: “Oh, okay, yeah. That’s... that’s gross.”

Stephanie : “Bye!” (00:07:33 -->00:07:54)

Seth (interlocutor) previously was offered to come to Stephanie (speaker)’s after-prom party. The offer was accepted and caused the speaker to feel happy. The speaker stated the utterance, which was marked as bold to deliver her commitment of future action. The speaker committed without promising the action would be done and did not involve benefit for the interlocutor as the speaker did it for herself. Stephanie as the speaker said she was going to let him out as she wanted to make entrance by firstly checking her make up through mirror. A sock held by the interlocutor was also asked to be hand in to her because it belonged to Blaine. Thus, it demonstrates that the speaker used commissive acts of threaten.

*Data 8*

Stephanie got a complaint from Martha as she did not like Stephanie to be too romantic with Blaine. Then, they were stepping down the stairs while having Stephanie, who was looking for Martha’s lake house keys.

Stephanie : “Oh my God, I promise you have nothing to worry about. You’re the best. Thank you so much, Marth. You know you’re invited, right?”

Martha : “Did you just invite me to a party that’s at my own house?” (00:09:06--> 00:09:15)

Stephanie (speaker) was looking for the lake house keys of Martha (interlocutor)’s parents. The speaker tried to find those on her bag, but she could not get the keys. Then, the interlocutor took the keys out of her bag and handed it to the speaker. While giving the keys, the interlocutor felt annoyed by the behavior of the speaker as she was not responsible for the keys. The speaker then uttered the utterance above to commit to do a good action. Through the utterance, the speaker promised to not do the same thing in the future. She said she would not make the interlocutor to feel worry about the keys again. Seeing that she had gotten the keys back, the speaker thanked the interlocutor. It sums up that the commissive acts of promise was used to show the speaker’s commitment.

*Data 9*

Stephanie finally woke up from her 20-year coma that happened because of the cheerleader accident. Because it takes two decades, Stephanie found everything was



weird and illogical to her.

Doctor : "You've been in a coma for almost two decades."

Stephanie : "That doesn't sound right."

Doctor : "I know this is a lot to process, but we'll just take this nice and slow." (00:17:54-->00: 18:03)

Doctor (speaker) visited Stephanie (interlocutor) a while after the patient had been conscious. The speaker told the interlocutor that she had been in the coma for 20 years, even though the interlocutor did not believe in her. The speaker then added by saying that it indeed took very long time. However, the speaker made a commitment regarding her health by promising to take care of the interlocutor with nice and slow treatment. In the utterance marked in bold, it is shown there has the promise of the speaker that would be done and benefit the interlocutor. In the light of the analysis, it concludes the use of commissive acts of promise was found in the utterance.

#### *Data 10*

Stephanie had just arrived at Tiffany's house. At first, Tiffany did not even recognize Stephanie as she had not met her for so long. Stephanie unexpectedly found her boyfriend in 20 years lived together with Tiffany.

Stephanie : "Um, where's Blaine? Just get me Blaine and um..."

Tiffany : "I'm so sorry. He is just so swamped right now with work." (00:22:37--> 00:22:44)

Stephanie (speaker) came to Tiffany (interlocutor) after going through 20-year coma. The speaker came as she noticed that the interlocutor resided together with Blaine. It caused Stephanie to find Blaine by asking the interlocutor. However, the interlocutor did not welcome the speaker as a guest. She attempted to kick the speaker out and the interlocutor did mention that Blaine was very busy because of this work. The utterance produced by the interlocutor showed that the speaker refused to let the speaker to meet her husband. The interlocutor did not allow the speaker to stay longer at her house. It defines that the speaker declared the commissive acts of refuse to reject the offer.

#### *Data 11*

Previously, Tiffany had tried to stay away from Stephanie because the woman wanted to meet her husband. However, it became uneasy for her as the woman kept looking at Tiffany. It led Tiffany to say good words to her and slowly leave her.

Tiffany : "So, maybe when you're feeling better and a little bit more stable, we could do brunch sometime."

Stephanie : "Blaine!" (00:23:26 -->00:23:33)

Tiffany (speaker) felt annoyed regarding the presence of Stephanie (interlocutor). The speaker did not expect the interlocutor would come after disappearing for 20 years. Because the speaker lived with the interlocutor's boyfriend, the interlocutor was unhappy and tried her best to have the chance to meet Blaine. By using the utterance, the speaker offered the interlocutor to have a brunch whenever the interlocutor felt better. The speaker used the utterance to let the interlocutor to notice that the speaker would do the future action if it was accepted. Based on the analysis, it confirms that type of commissive acts in the utterance is commissive acts of offer.

#### *Data 12*

Stephanie approached Martha, who was at the car. The woman came to her because she desired to continue her senior year in 37 years old. This surprised Martha as the woman could not help Stephanie for this case.

Martha : "Steph... I can't let an almost 40-year-old woman... into high

school.”

Stephanie : “Yeah, but you heard the doctor. I'm still 17 mentally.” (00:30:44--> 00:30:54)

Martha (speaker) came out from the car as Stephanie (interlocutor) kept talking to her. The speaker declared that it was impossible to let the interlocutor into the high school. Instead, the speaker offered her online classes and GED courses at the community college. By delivering the utterance above, the speaker committed to refuse the interlocutor's offer in which she wanted to be back to high school. The utterance involves speaker's refusal of letting a 37-year-old woman into high school. Conforming to the utterance, it displays commissive acts of refuse considering the speaker refused the future action.

#### *Data 13*

Stephanie approached Seth at the school library. The woman came to visit her as they did not meet for so long. Considering the man had to cover drama class, the man left Stephanie.

Seth : “I'll see you later.”

Stephanie : “Okay.” (00:45:55--> 00:45:56)

Seth (speaker) informed Stephanie (interlocutor) that he had work to do while they were talking at the library. They were sitting at chairs and the speaker suddenly had to leave her because of work. Then, the speaker said he would see her later after getting things done. It was said while the speaker was going out from the library. The interlocutor answered “okay” to respond the speaker's utterance. By uttering the utterance, the interlocutor accepted to see him in the future as they were lots things to talk. Based on the analysis, it reveals that the speakers showed her commitment by conveying commissive acts of accept.

#### *Data 14*

After attending the class, Stephanie went back to her house. The woman hurriedly ran into kitchen as her father was there. She would like to have a phone from her father.

Stephanie : “... I promise you, I will not go over the minutes. Really, it's for my own personal safety, 'cause what happens if I get kidnapped?”

Chris : “I think if you get kidnapped, Stephanie, they'll probably take your phone.” (00:46:05-->00:46:21)

Stephanie (speaker) arrived home and hurriedly came to Chris (interlocutor). At that time, the interlocutor was entering kitchen by bringing a plate and a glass as he had just finished his dinner. In the utterance, the speaker committed to do a future action that could benefit the interlocutor and the speaker believed that she was obliged to do so. The speaker wanted her father to buy her a phone as she did not have it. She said that phone could help her to be in safe situation in order to convince her father. From the utterance, it implies that the speaker promised to not go over the minutes if she was given a phone. It is clear that the commissive acts of promise involves in the utterance.

#### *Data 15*

Stephanie was invited to go to Natural History Museum. The last time three of them went there was 20 years ago and Seth wanted her to go with him this weekend.

Stephanie : “Oh my God. You, me, and Martha just watched that a couple weekends ago.”

Seth : “Oh no, actually, I think you're thinking of 1,000 weekends ago.”

Stephanie : “Oh. Right. Mm. Okay, I would go, but I've got a party this weekend.” (00:49:17-->00:49:21)

While Stephanie (speaker) was doing her make-up, Seth (interlocutor) was offering her to join an event with him. The speaker earlier did not want to do so, but the interlocutor convinced her that they had not been to the event for so long. The speaker accepted to go with him by saying she would go with him. In accepting, the speaker proposed to go to the concert in other days as she had things to do within this week. The speaker indeed did not refuse because she mentioned that she would go. It is clear from the delivery of word “Okay” to indicate that she committed to go. Relating to the explanation, it infers that the speaker committed to do the future actions by performing commissive acts of accept.

## CONCLUSION

As informative media, movie takes part in showing social phenomena and this research revealed that the movie entitled “Senior Year” has the phenomena of commissive acts. The characters of the movie used commissive acts to talk about their commitments towards future action. Based on the findings, the movie was reported to have 67 utterances of commissive acts. Those all were discovered in five different types of commissive acts. Accept had 17 data, threaten showed nine data, nine data were also found in promise, refuse got 11 data, and 16 data were discovered in offer.

Besides total data, this research also found the most common type. Commissive acts of accept was the common type considering the movie characters frequently produced that type to show their commitments of future action. It implies that the characters preferred showing commitments by accepting the future action. In addition, having the understanding of commissive acts is indeed beneficial because every type represents different intention. Understanding all commissive acts types benefits the communication process between speaker and interlocutor as communication partners. In other words, people that understand the use of commissive acts can pragmatically interpret the implied meaning. For future researchers, they are suggested to combine the theory of commissive acts types with other theories. The researcher also recommends future researchers to take different media other than movie as data source.

## REFERENCES

- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Chicester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatics stylistics*. Edinuburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Caniago, Y., & Afriana, A. (2022). Commissive act used in Fatherhood movie (2021). *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 905–913. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v10i1.2863>
- Desica, D., & Ambalegin, A. (2022). Commissive speech acts found in “Onward” movie by Dan Scanlon. *CaLLs: Journal of Culture, Arts, Literature, and Linguistics*, 7(2), 197–208. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.30872/calls.v7i2.6186>
- Devi, M. F., & Degaf, A. (2021). An analysis of commissive speech act used by the main character in the “Knives Out” movie. *Paradigm: Journal of Language and*

- Literary Studies*, 4(1), 43–52.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18860/prdg.v4i1.10932>
- Gea, D., & Johan, M. (2020). Commissive speech act in Donald Trump's speech campaign. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 8(2), 350–356.  
<https://doi.org/10.34050/jib.v8i2.1178>
- Hardcastle, A. (2022). *Senior Year*. Netflix. <https://www.netflix.com/id-en/title/80217525?preventIntent=true>
- Husain, A., Hamamah, H., & Nurhayani, I. (2020). Commissive speech act in Indonesian presidential debate. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 14(1), 81.  
<https://doi.org/10.19105/ojbs.v14i1.3141>
- Istiqomah, R. A., & Ibrohim, B. (2020). Commissive speech act in the English translation of Holy Qur'an Surah Thaha by M. A. S. Abdel Halem: A Pragmatic study. *Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, Indonesia*, 1(1), 19–29. <http://jurnal.uinbanten.ac.id/index.php/ijes/article/view/2908>
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research Design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pradipta, B., & Sugiharti, D. (2022). ADJACENCY PAIRS IN STARSTRUCK MOVIE. *PARAFRASE : Jurnal Kajian Kebahasaan & Kesastraan*, 21(2), 192–202.  
<https://doi.org/10.30996/parafrase.v21i2.5590>
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. In *Cambridge University Press*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sugiyono, S. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan r & d*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Virginia, F., & Ambalegin, A. (2021). Directive acts uttered by main character in I care a lot movie. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 5(2), 237–244.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v5i2.237-244>

