



Sociopragmatic Analysis of Witness Illocution Speech in the 2024 Presidential Election Dispute Trial

Yuniasih; Esti Swastika Sari; Prihadi; Tadkiroatun Musfiroh

Master of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i6.5892>

Abstract

This study will discuss the act of witness illocution in the 2024 Presidential Election dispute trial with a sociopragmatic study, highlighting the use of language in conveying arguments, defending positions, and opposing opponents. The focus on the illocution aspect of court communication shows how language can shape social reality and support a fair and transparent judicial process. This study uses a qualitative approach with case study methods and note-taking techniques to collect and analyze data from video of the 2024 Presidential Election dispute hearing, using a sociopragmatic approach that includes oral discourse analysis to identify language patterns and witness communication strategies. At the trial, witnesses use various forms of speech such as representative, assertive, directive, commissive, and expressive to convey their information, beliefs, instructions, commitments, and feelings, which reflect their social norms and ethics as well as their social role in the courtroom. Compliance with these norms is important to maintain integrity, fairness, and professionalism in the judicial process.

Keywords: *Sociopragmatic; Witness Illocution Speech; 2024 Presidential Election Dispute Trial*

Introduction

The 2024 Presidential Election in Indonesia is a political event that has recently captured public attention. This event is very important and has a great impact on the Indonesian state so that it becomes a spotlight, both local and international media. Every aspect from the campaign to the vote count cannot be separated from the spotlight. One of the stages that cannot be separated from the spotlight is the Presidential Election dispute hearing which was held after the announcement of the voting results. This session became an official forum for parties who felt aggrieved in the election process to show alleged fraud and raise objections. At this hearing, there were various parties involved, including the legal team of the contesting candidates, witnesses, and experts.

The Presidential Election dispute trial is a place to reveal the truth of facts and legal justice that is transparent and fair. In its implementation, the use of language is the main tool in delivering arguments, defenses, judges' decision-making and public opinion. Language is an organized set of sounds that serve as a tool to convey something that can create cooperation between the speaker and the listener (Patada, 2011). Language is a means that allows humans to communicate well with others. Language can not only convey thoughts, feelings, and information between individuals, but also as the main foundation in maintaining social relationships. Language is an effective communication tool in conveying thoughts,

intentions, and goals to others. The main function of language is as a means of communication to convey messages or meanings from one person to another (Mailani et al., 2022).

In the context of communication, proper language and courtesy are very important, especially in the courtroom. Understanding the accuracy of responses refers to the integration between languages used and the appropriateness of the meaning between the conversation and the response given (Devianty, 2017). Therefore, the language used can influence decisions and the formation of social reality in the courtroom. Every statement produced by witnesses, judges, and lawyers is not only literal, but also has profound social and pragmatic implications.

In the Presidential Election dispute hearing, various elements in communication are very important. The clarity of the message is not only about the words used, but also about the context and the situation that is taking place. The language used must be in accordance with democratic values, applicable legal norms, and public expectations for justice. Language in its existence always plays a role as a means of speech in communication, either directly or indirectly, which can express the speaker's thoughts and intentions to be conveyed (Purwanti, 2021). Thus, the use of appropriate language can avoid unwanted conflicts.

Social and cultural context plays a crucial role in the use of language in the courtroom of the Presidential Election dispute. Culture has a significant role in shaping the way people use and understand language, especially Indonesian (Mahyudi, 2024). Every word spoken must be structured by considering the values that are the main foothold in society, such as justice, truth, and openness. In an effort to maintain the integrity and legitimacy of the judicial process, the participants of the trial must pay close attention to this context. Thus, communication that occurs in the courtroom will take place smoothly and support the creation of an environment conducive to fair and transparent law enforcement. Therefore, understanding the norms can avoid using offensive and tense language.

In addition to understanding the norms, understanding the dimensions of illocution and perlocution also has an important role in the course of the trial and the decisions taken by the judge. The speech actions carried out by the participants of the session not only function as a medium to convey facts or arguments, but also as a way to form a legally recognized social reality. Speech is a series of actions that are conveyed through speech, such as apologies, complaints, praises, invitations, promises, or requests (Yule, 2018). Therefore, understanding speech is very important for smooth communication and decision-making in the courtroom.

This study will discuss the act of witness illocution in the 2024 Presidential Election dispute trial with a sociopragmatic study. Through this study, it is hoped that we can see words, sentences, and communication strategies to build arguments, defend positions, and oppose opponents in the 2024 Presidential Election dispute hearing. Speech is a category that has many pragmatic phenomena that can be studied (Commings, 2007). Speech is a pragmatic concept that refers to how a person's speech not only functions as a conveyor of information, but also to carry out actions (Tarigan, 1986). The act of speech includes two forms of speech, namely direct (verbal) and indirect (written) speech.

Communication always involves speech which is an important element in pragmatic studies (Wulandari & Utomo, 2021). The act of illocution speech is speech that states something that has a certain intention (Searle, 1969). Through socioopgraphical analysis, it is hoped that it can explore how the communication used by witnesses to achieve their goals.

Sociopragmatic

Sociopragmatics is a field of study that combines pragmatics with sociology. This means that sociopragmatic studies pragmatic aspects that place more emphasis on specific social contexts. On the other hand, pragmatic studies whose main focus is on linguistic aspects are known as pragmalinguistics

(Leech, 2015). Sociopragmatic studies are the study of linguistic entities that combine sociolinguistic and pragmatic approaches in a particular cultural or cultural context. In other words, socioopracitics examines the use of language in communication with social communities based on the context of its existence (Rahardi, 2009). Thus, socioopracitics provides a rich framework for understanding and analyzing language use in diverse social contexts, beyond the boundaries outlined by traditional pragmalinguistics.

Socioopracitics emphasizes the relationship between social functions and speech delivered by speakers. Socioopracitics is the study of local and local conditions that are more specific to the use of language. In this context, the use of language certainly has a certain purpose and should be conveyed politely in accordance with applicable norms. The clearer and more transparent the meaning of a speech, the more direct and effective the speech will be in conveying the message (Ode, 2015). Polite language is essential to ensure that the message can be conveyed well. However, in practice, speech is influenced by various social factors, such as social situations, social status, and situational contexts. The social function of this language includes the cultural aspects that shape the way speakers communicate. The social function of the various types of speech used by speakers, such as witnesses in certain contexts, plays an important role in the effectiveness of these speech acts to achieve the purpose of communication. By understanding the social function and cultural context of speech, communication can become more effective and on target.

Forms of Language and Speech Actions of Illocution

Formally, sentences can be categorized into three main types: declarative, interactive, and imperative. According to Chaer (2009), declarative sentences are used to convey information about an event or occurrence so that others know about it. An interrogative sentence, as explained by Yumi et al. (2019), is a question sentence that aims to ask for an answer in the form of a confession, explanation, reason, or opinion from the listener or reader. Meanwhile, imperative sentences, according to Chaer (2016), are sentences that expect a response in the form of actions or deeds from the listener, with the core meaning in the form of demands for someone to react or respond to what is said. Each of these three types of sentences has a specific function in communication: conveying information, requesting information, and asking for action.

Speech is a part of linguistics that studies the interpersonal communication behavior of language users, with speech that can contain the meaning of statements, questions, and commands (Oktavianus, 2006). Speech acts are divided into three types: locution, illocution, and perlocution. The act of speech illocution consists of representative, assertive, directive, commissive, and expressive. The act of speaking representative includes the act of declaring, reporting, showing, mentioning, prosecuting, acknowledging, testifying, and speculating (R, 2014). Assertive speech includes claiming, complaining, and declaring, while directive speech includes asking, commanding, and requesting. Expressive speech involves praising and criticizing, and expressing pleasure, while declarative speech includes stating the truth, disagreeing, and agreeing. In this study, the type of commissive speech act was not found because the speech situation did not support or encourage the speaker to perform speech actions that involved a commitment to future actions, such as making promises, swearing, and praying (Sariasih, 2017). Directive speech has the function of commanding, requesting, prohibiting, reprimanding, and asking questions that can be seen from the interaction carried out, showing that directive speech is carried out in the context of a conversation with the goal of communication to be achieved (Ardianto, 2013).

The explanation illustrates two important aspects of linguistics: the types of sentences and the act of speech. First, sentences can be grouped into three main types, namely declarative, interrogative, and imperative, each of which has a specific communicative purpose in conveying information, requesting information, or requesting action from the listener. This explanation refers to the basic concepts of sentence structure and function from various linguists such as Chaer (2009) and Yumi et al. (2019). Meanwhile, in the realm of speech acts, the explanation details the types of illocution speech acts, which include representative, assertive, directive, commissive, and expressive. The focus on commissive speech

acts, which were not found in the context of the research referenced, provides an understanding of how communication situations can affect the types of speech acts that arise in language interactions. By integrating these concepts, the explanation provides a comprehensive picture of how language is used to communicate effectively in a variety of contexts.

Methods

The research uses a qualitative approach with a case study method. The source of data is a video in the 2024 presidential election dispute hearing during April. Data was collected using the technique of listening and recording then recording the statements of witnesses in the 2024 presidential election dispute hearing. To analyze the act of illocution speech in the 2024 Presidential Election dispute hearing, this study uses a comprehensive socioopractic approach. The research methods include discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and text analysis. The data analyzed consisted of court transcripts, video recordings, and related legal documents. Discourse analysis helps identify language patterns and communication strategies used by witnesses in the trial.

Result and Discussion

Result

Speech is an important element of money in supporting verbal interactions. This means that speech acts as an important factor in the situation of conversation or communication between two or more people (Wiyatasari, 2015). Illocution speech is a type of speech that not only serves to convey or inform something, but also to carry out an action. This act of speech is often referred to as "the act of doing something". Identification of illocution is considered difficult because it relates to who the talking partner is, as well as when and where speech occurs (Rahma, 2018). The following is an explanation of speech acts in the 2024 presidential election dispute hearing.

Table of Illocution Speech Actions

| No | Shape | Kind | | | | | Sum |
|----|--------------|----------------|---------|-----------|------------|------------|-----|
| | | Representative | Asertif | Directive | Commission | Expressive | |
| 1. | Declative | 14 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 13 | 58 |
| 2. | Interogative | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| 3. | Imperative | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Sum | 15 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 13 | 60 |

Based on its form, the act of illusory speech consists of declarative sentences, interrogative sentences, and imperative sentences.

1. Directive Form

a. Representative

The act of representative speech is used to state a fact or information.

- (1) “Oknum polisi Pak dan yang yang jelas itu Oknum polisi yang saya diberi tahu kepala Desa itu Apakah polisi polsek atau polres, saya juga kurang paham”

(Context: Ganjar-Mahfud camp witness answers questions from the judge regarding the perpetrators of threatening police officers)

Speech (1) is classified as a representative speech which in this context is a witness from the Ganjar-Mahfud camp, providing information to the judge regarding the identity of police personnel who are suspected of being involved in the threat. This information is based on the knowledge obtained from the village head. The speaker explained that the identity of the police is still unclear whether it comes from the police or the police to show the characteristics of representative speech that serves to provide information that is considered correct by the speaker and is expected to be trusted by the listener. In this case, the witness tries to convey the information he has as clearly as possible to the judge, even though there is uncertainty in the details of the information.

- (2) “Jadi, nama saya Khairul Anas Wahyu si robot biru nomor telepon saya ada di situ baik lanjut ini bisa dibaca”

(Context: the Ganjar-Mahfud camp witness introduced himself after being welcomed by the judge)

Speech (2) is used by witnesses to introduce themselves, give instructions, and affirm information with the aim of ensuring a clear and effective flow of presentation in the context of the trial. This helps build the credibility of witnesses and facilitates the process of presenting evidence before the panel of judges and other parties involved.

b. Asertif

Assertive speech is used to express confidence or commitment to the truth being said.

- (3) “Semuanya ada 7 orang berikut Camat tapi yang di belakang masyarakat banyak gitu Pak”

(Context: Ganjar-Mahfud camp witness answers questions from the judge regarding the number of people involved in the 2024 presidential election fraud in Cikaso Village RT 03RW 02)

Speech (3) is classified as assertive speech because witnesses from the Ganjar-Mahfud camp stated unequivocally the number of people involved in the incident in question, namely seven people including the Sub-district Head. The witness also added information that behind him there were many people. This statement is delivered with the belief that the information is true and it is expected that the listener, in this case the judge, will accept the information as fact.

- (4) “Yang halaman pertama tadi maaf, ini yang mulia ini kan 1830 ini bukan saya yang menangkap tapi betul sekali yang selalu berjalan di internet termasuk situs MK ini juga di pantau terus”

(Context: Ganjar-Mahfud camp witness after being invited by the judge to present his testimony)

Speech (4) is used by the witness not only to convey information, but also to affirm his belief in the correctness of the information, providing certainty to the panel of judges and related parties regarding the accuracy of the data discussed.

c. Directive

Directive speech is a type of speech that aims to make the listener do something. In directives, the speaker tries to influence the listener's actions, which can be requests, orders, suggestions, or pleas.

- (5) “Saya serahkan sama ketua RT pak”

(Context: Ganjar-Mahfud camp witness answering questions from the judge regarding the provision of forms at polling stations)

The speech of (5) witnesses from the Ganjar-Mahfud camp answered questions from the judge regarding the provision of forms at the polling station. This speech is classified as directive speech because the witness gives instructions or delegates responsibility to the head of the RT to receive or handle the form at the polling station. The witness not only provided information, but also directed action to the head of the RT. This act of directive speech shows that the witness directs the listener to perform a certain action, in this case handling the form at the polling station. This reflects an effort to shift responsibility or ensure that the task is carried out by a designated person, namely the head of the RT.

(6) “Mohon dibantu tayangannya dari operator”

(Context: the witness of the Ganjar-Mahfud camp answered regarding the presentation of fraudulent data after being welcomed by the judge)

Speech (4) serves to ensure that the flow of evidence presentation runs smoothly and according to plan. The use of this act of speech demonstrates politeness, clarity, and effective control in the formal context of the trial, which is very important to support the testimony and credibility of witnesses before the panel of judges and other parties.

d. Commissive

Commissive speech is a type of speech in which the speaker commits to doing something in the future. Commissive speech involves a promise, oath, offer, or refusal to perform an action.

(7) “Namanya nggak bisa saya sebutkan, Pak!”

(Context: Ganjar-Mahfud camp witness answered the judge's question regarding the name of the village head at the UN PPS secretariat office)

Speech (4) of witnesses from the Ganjar-Mahfud camp answered the judge's question regarding the name of the village head at the PPS UN secretariat office. This speech is classified as a commissive speech because the witness explicitly refused to provide information about a person's name. By saying "I can't name it," the witness committed not to reveal his name, showing his unequivocal rejection of the judge's request. This act of commissive speech shows that the witness is committed not to doing something, namely not mentioning the name of the village head. It is a form of negative commitment in which the witness promises to withhold certain information from the judge.

e. Expressive

Expressive speech is used by speakers to express or express their feelings and attitudes towards a situation or event. Through expressive speech, the speaker conveys emotions such as sadness, happiness, disappointment, or gratitude.

(8) “Saya langsung meluncur kembali ke kabupaten Gunung Kidul dan saya langsung datang ke lokasi sekitar pukul 13.03 dan anak itu masih ditahan saya merasa sedih yang mulia karena Bung Karno memerdekakan negara ini dalam pembukaan undang-undang salah satunya kita merdeka untuk melindungi segenap bangsa Indonesia tetapi kenapa ada rakyat yang tidak bersenjata di aniaya oleh aparat bersenjata apalagi yang dijelaskan Ibu akhirnya yang mulia kami menegosiasi kepada kedua aparat yang melakukan penangkapan tersebut seandainya anak itu”

(context: Ganjar-Mahfud camp witness answered the judge's questions regarding the incident experienced)

Speech (5) of witnesses from the Ganjar-Mahfud camp answered the judge's questions regarding the incident he experienced. This speech is classified as an expressive speech act because the witness expressed his sadness over the situation that occurred. The witness expressed his emotions towards the detention of the child which he thought was unfair and contrary to the spirit of independence fought for by Karno. This expressive speech shows the main characteristic of expressive speech, which is to express the speaker's personal feelings about an event. In this case, the witness expressed his sadness and disappointment with the treatment of the authorities against the unarmed people. In addition, the witness also conveyed his views on the injustice that occurred, which added to the emotional depth of the speech.

2. Interrogative Form

Directive

Directive speech is a type of speech act to make the reader take action, such as answering questions, providing information, or performing certain tasks.

(9) "Maksudnya nama kelurahannya?"

(Konteks: tuturan disampaikan oleh saksi kubu Ganjar-Mahfud untuk menanyakan kejelasan pertanyaan hakim "Lho itu persidangan enggak usah, nanti malah keterangan bapak tadi diragukan nanti")

Speech 6, the witness asked for clarification from the judge. The purpose of this question is for the judge to explain or confirm whether what is meant is the name of the village. This question directs the judge to provide clarification. This indicates that the witness is requesting action from the judge in the form of further explanations or answers. The question is an explicit request to the judge to clarify or provide additional information.

Discussion

The results of the study show that we see various types of speech that reflect the various communicative goals that speakers have in the context of trials. Here's the explanation.

1. First, in the category of directive forms, the representative type is used to provide information that the speaker considers correct to the listener, such as in speech (1) where a witness provides information about the identity of a police officer who is suspected of being involved in the threat.
2. Speech (2) features the use of representative speech as part of the witness's efforts to introduce himself clearly before the judge.
3. In the assertive category, witnesses use assertive speech to express their belief or commitment to the truth of the information presented. A vivid example is speech (3) in which the witness unequivocally states the number of people involved in a particular event, demonstrating his belief in the veracity of the information.
 1. The same is true of speech (4), where the witness not only conveys information, but also affirms his belief in the truth of the information.
 2. In the directive category, the witness uses directive speech to influence the listener's actions, such as in speech (5) where the witness gives instructions to the head of the RT to handle the form at the polling station.
 3. In speech (6), the witness asked for help from the operator to ensure the smooth presentation of evidence.

4. In the commissive category, the witness refuses to do anything in the future, as seen in speech (7) where the witness refuses to name a person, indicating the witness's commitment to withholding certain information from the judge.
5. Finally, in the expressive category, witnesses use expressive speech to express their feelings and attitudes towards a situation or event, such as in speech (8) where the witness expresses his feelings of sadness over the detention of a child that he or she thinks is unfair.

Norms and Ethics

Social norms and ethics play an important role in regulating behavior and speech in the courtroom. As a language speaker, one must be able to maintain the standard of the language. At that time, in an effort to safeguard personal interests and other interests (Yusuf, 2021). In the midst of a serious and formal legal process, witnesses have a moral and ethical responsibility to give honest and accurate testimony. This is because the truth conveyed by witnesses can have a significant impact on the decisions taken by judges and jurors. Therefore, witnesses are expected to adhere to social norms that govern honesty and integrity in giving testimony.

Commissive speech, such as the one in the example "I can't name him, sir!", reflects the witness's commitment to comply with certain ethical or professional norms. In this case, the witness refuses to provide information that may be sensitive or confidential, such as a person's name. This action may be motivated by ethical considerations to maintain the privacy of individuals or to avoid the potential negative impact of disclosure of such information. In addition, in the context of the judiciary, there are also norms that govern certain confidentiality and confidentiality that must be maintained, as in the case of information related to privacy or public security.

Ethical norms also require witnesses to show respect and courtesy to the judge and other parties involved in the trial. This includes using appropriate language, following court protocols, and maintaining a proportionate and professional attitude. By adhering to these ethical norms, witnesses can gain trust and credibility from the authorities and ensure that the trial process runs smoothly and fairly. Thus, social norms and ethics act as guidelines that govern the behavior and speech of witnesses in the courtroom. Compliance with these norms is not only important for maintaining integrity and fairness in the judicial process, but also for ensuring that all parties involved are respected and treated fairly.

Social Role

The social roles played by witnesses, judges, and other parties in the courtroom have a significant impact on how they communicate and interact with each other. In the context of a trial, each individual has a role that has been assigned and is expected to fulfill certain tasks according to their respective roles. For example, witnesses have a leading role as providers of relevant and accurate information about events or facts related to the case at hand. Witnesses are expected to testify based on their own knowledge and experience, without bias or manipulation. Therefore, representative and assertive speech are very important in witness communication. Faramida et al. (2019), revealed that the act of representative speech aims to convey or explain what is in the speaker's mind by stating that it is called the act of representative speech. This act of speech tends to be subjective because it reveals information or explanations that come from the speaker's thoughts. The results of the study show that representative speech is used to convey facts or information that witnesses believe to be true, while assertive speech is used to express belief or commitment to the truth of the information presented. Both reflect the social expectation of witnesses to be a reliable and trusted source of information by the authorities. On the other hand, judges have different roles in the courtroom. They are responsible for directing the trial process, ensuring that the rules are followed, and evaluating the evidence and testimony presented in court.

The use of assertive speech by witnesses in trials plays an important role in reinforcing and reflecting the social roles of the various parties involved. The functions of assertive Illocution speech,

namely *vermuten* (to suspect), *sagen* (to declare), *schwören* (to swear), *sich beschweren* (to complain), *entgegenen* (to refute), and *beantworten* (to answer) (Fitria & Saksono, 2021). Judges need information delivered with confidence to make informed decisions, witnesses use assertive speech to confirm their role as a credible source of information, lawyers rely on convincing testimony to build their arguments, and defendants need to respond to that information in their defense. Thus, assertive speech not only serves to express beliefs but also helps maintain the dynamics of social roles in the context of trials, supporting a fair and credible legal process.

In directive speech, it is used to make the driver perform a certain action. Directive speech acts can function as competitive, fun, cooperative, and contradictory (Pusparita & Sumadyo, 2020). It can also help ensure that directions or instructions are going well. Directive speech plays an important role in the trial because it not only helps ensure that the direction or instruction runs well, but also influences and reflects the social roles of the various parties involved. The use of this act of speech helps to strengthen authority, facilitate the delivery of information, control the flow of the trial, and defend the rights and interests of the parties involved. Thus, directive speech acts become an effective and essential communication tool in the context of trials.

Expressive speech was used by witnesses from the Ganjar-Mahfud camp to express his sadness and disappointment over the detention which he thought was unfair. In his speech (8), the witness not only explained the incident factually but also conveyed his emotions deeply, showing sadness and disappointment with the treatment of the apparatus which he felt was contrary to the values of independence fought for by Karno. It shows the humanity and empathy of witnesses, who play an important role in building an emotional narrative in front of the judge and the trial audience. This expressive speech shows the social role of witnesses as individuals who not only convey facts, but also fight for justice and humanity. In the context of a trial, expressions of feelings like this can affect the perception of judges and audiences, adding an emotional layer that can strengthen or change the direction of legal decisions. The social role of witnesses as defenders of truth and justice is strengthened through the use of expressive speech, which invites all parties to consider the humanitarian aspect in the decision-making process.

Conclusion

The results of the study show variations in the illocution speech used by witnesses in the 2024 Presidential Election dispute hearing. There are various types of speech acts that reflect the various communicative goals that the speaker has in the context of the trial. In the category of directive forms, the representative type is used to provide information that the speaker considers to be correct to the listener, while assertively is used to express confidence or commitment to the truth of the information conveyed. In the context of trials, social norms and ethics also play an important role in regulating the behavior and speech of witnesses. They are expected to give honest and accurate testimony, adhere to proper language standards, and safeguard personal interests and other interests in serious and formal legal proceedings. Thus, the results of this study provide a deeper understanding of how language is used in the context of the 2024 Presidential Election dispute trial as well as the importance of social norms and ethics in verbal interactions in the courtroom.

References

- Comings, L. (2007). *Pragmatic: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Student Library.
- Devianty, R. (2017). Language as a reflection of culture. *Tarbiyah Journal*, 24(2). <http://jurnaltarbiyah.uinsu.ac.id/index.php/tarbiyah/article/view/167/211> .

- Faramida, I., Chaelina, & Hermandra. (2019). Representative Speech Acts. *Journal of Tuah Education and Language Teaching*, 1(1), 78–86.
- Fitria, H. K., & Saksono, L. (2021). The function of assertive illocution speech in the script of the drama *Dantons Tod* by Georg Büchner. *Identitat*, 10(2).
- Leeth, G. (2015). *Pragmatic principles*. M.D.D. Press UI translation.
- Mahyudi, A. (2024). Community communication patterns in Indonesian in Amawang Kiri village. *FLEET: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 340–347.
- Mailani, O., Nuraeni, I., Syakila, S. A., & Lazuardi, J. (2022). Language as a means of communication in human life. *Kampret Journal*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.35335/kampret.v1i1.8>.
- Pateda, M. (2011). *Linguistics An Introduction*. Rineka Cipta.
- Purwanti, C. (2021). The role of language in political communication. *Journal of Communication Vision*, 19(02), 192. <https://doi.org/10.22441/visikom.v19i02.11391>.
- Pusparita, I., & Sumadyo, B. (2020). Directive Speech Actions and Their Functions in the 2017 Kompas Selected Short Story Collection "Storytelling Class." *Discourse: Journal of Education Indonesian*, 3(01), 35. <https://doi.org/10.30998/diskursus.v3i01.6682>
- Rahardi, K. (2009). *Socioopragmatic*. PT Gelora Aksara Pratama.
- Rahma, A. . (2018). Analysis of Illocution Speech in the Dialogue of Animated Films Achieving Dreams. *Surabaya Journal: Scriptium*, 22.
- Searle, JR (1969). *Speech Act: Essay on the Philosophy of Language*. University Press.
- Tarigan, HG (1986). *Pragmatic Teaching*. Space.
- Wiyatasari, R. (2015). Directives Speech Translation Techniques in the Short Stories *Doctor of Magic* by Iwaya Sazanami and *Larilah Melos* by Dazai Osamu. *Izumi Journal*, 4(2).
- Wulandari, E., & Utomo, A. P. . (2021). Analysis of Representative Speech Actions in the Video "Quick Tricks to Answer Jerome's Version of English Math Questions!" On Jerome Polin's Youtube Channel. *Indonesian Journal of Literature*, 10(1), 65–70. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jsi.v10i1.45120>.
- Yule, G. (2018). *Pragmatic* (I. F. Wahyuni (ed.)). Student Library.
- Yusuf, Y. (2021). Representation of Politeness in Language in the Roman "Greenhouse" by Pramodeya Ananta Toer: A Socioopragmatic Study. *BIP: Journal of Indonesian Prima*, 3(1), 7–15.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).