



AN ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF ILLOCUTIONARY SPEECH ACTS IN THE *RUANG 28* PODCAST ON THE NOICE YOUTUBE CHANNEL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR LEARNING DISCUSSION TEXTS IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Afiifah Rahmah Putri¹, Reni Nur Eriyani², Rahmah Purwahida³

State University of Jakarta

afifahrahmahp@gmail.com¹, reni_ervani@unj.ac.id², rahmah.purwahida@unj.ac.id³

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the types of illocutionary speech acts found in the *Ruang 28* podcast, as well as to explain their implicit implications for discussion learning at the junior high school level. This study uses a qualitative descriptive method. Data was taken from two podcast episodes through a listening-note technique and explained using Searle's theory. The results show that from 600 dialogue excerpts, 659 speech acts were found, with details: assertive (62.22%), directive (24.73%), expressive (11.23%), declarative (1.21%), and commissive (0.61%). Assertive speech acts are the dominant form, especially in the functions of stating and informing. This indicates that most of the speech contains opinions or information. These results can be implied in Indonesian language learning, especially in discussion text material at the junior high school level.

Keywords: *illocutionary speech acts; podcast; Ruang 28; discussion text*

INTRODUCTION

Language plays a vital role as a means of communication in human life, both directly and indirectly. According to Chaer (2014:53), language is present in almost all human activities as social beings, as it allows individuals to express thoughts, emotions, and to interact with others. The success of communication largely depends on the speaker's ability to convey intentions accurately and contextually. This phenomenon is the focus of pragmatics, a branch of linguistics that examines language use in specific contexts. Yule (in Setiawati, 2018:27) states that pragmatics studies the meaning of utterances based on context, indicating that meaning is not solely determined by linguistic structure but also by the surrounding social and cultural conditions.

The development of information and communication technology has significantly transformed how people interact, including in the realm of spoken communication. One medium that has gained popularity as a communication tool is the podcast. Initially emerging as a form of entertainment, podcasts have evolved into platforms for expressing opinions, engaging in discussions, and delivering interactive social criticism. Their popularity has increased in line with the growing public demand for informative content that is flexible and easily accessible.

One podcast that is particularly relevant to pragmatic studies is *Ruang 28*, broadcast on the Noice YouTube channel. This podcast presents two-way discussions with a casual yet critical approach to current social issues. The speakers in *Ruang 28* not only express opinions but also respond to, critique, and strengthen each other's arguments. This interactive format fosters dynamic speech patterns and reflects various types of

speech acts in real spoken communication. Moreover, the use of humor in delivering content makes the discussions more engaging without diminishing the depth of information conveyed.

This study focuses on analyzing illocutionary speech acts used by the speakers in the *Ruang 28* podcast. Illocutionary acts, as classified by Searle (in Kentary et al., 2015:64), include five categories: assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. Each category represents a specific communicative intent depending on the context in which it is used.

In the context of Indonesian language instruction at the junior high school level, discussion texts are an essential part of developing students' critical and argumentative thinking skills. However, overly theoretical teaching methods often hinder students' understanding of real-life argumentative communication. Therefore, utilizing podcasts such as *Ruang 28* as contextual learning resources becomes a relevant and effective alternative. By observing various types of speech acts within authentic discussions, students can learn to identify the functional use of language in argumentative discourse.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative method with a focus on pragmatic analysis, particularly illocutionary speech acts. This method was chosen as it is appropriate for examining language phenomena in a natural and in-depth manner through spoken data. The data source consisted of two episodes of the *Ruang 28* podcast on the YouTube Noice channel, selected using purposive sampling based on several criteria, including socially relevant topics, diversity of speakers, intensity of interaction, and their potential as educational material.

The two episodes analyzed were:

- *Mamat Korupsi, Cania dan Gilbhas Cepu-in ke KPK*
- *Pandji Pragiwaksono Vs David Nurbianto: Siapa yang Cocok Jadi Pejabat?!*

The data comprised utterances spoken by the participants, which were analyzed using Searle's theory of illocutionary acts, namely: assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative.

Data collection was conducted using observation and note-taking techniques, which included repeatedly viewing the videos, transcribing the utterances, identifying the speech context, and recording excerpts containing illocutionary acts. Data analysis followed the model proposed by Miles and Huberman, which includes three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study identified a total of 659 illocutionary speech acts from 600 dialogue excerpts taken from two episodes of the *Ruang 28* podcast. Based on Searle's classification, these speech acts are categorized into five types: assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. The distribution of the findings is presented in the following table:

**Table 1. Distribution of Illocutionary Speech Acts**

Type of Illocutionary Act	Function	Number of Utterances	Percentage
Assertive	Stating	297	45.06%
	Informing	93	14.11%
	Complaining	17	2.58%
	Claiming	3	0.45%
	Boasting	0	0.00%
Directive	Commanding	40	6.07%
	Suggesting	24	3.64%
	Questioning	95	14.42%
	Requesting (pleading)	0	0.00%
	Inviting	4	0.61%
Commissive	Promising	3	0.45%
	Offering	0	0.00%
	Swearing	1	0.15%
	Threatening	0	0.00%
Expressive	Praising	22	3.34%
	Teasing/Sarcasm	35	5.31%
	Thanking	15	2.28%
	Apologizing	2	0.30%
	Congratulating	0	0.00%
Declarative	Authorizing/Permitting	0	0.00%
	Deciding	8	1.21%
	Punishing	0	0.00%
	Dismissing	0	0.00%
Total		657	100%

The analysis revealed that the most dominant type of illocutionary speech act in the two episodes of the *Ruang 28* podcast was assertive type IA.1, which functions to state, accounting for 45.06% of the total. This speech act is used to express statements, opinions, or beliefs that the speaker considers to be true. The dominance of this type aligns with the narrative and informative nature of the podcast, which tends to focus on the articulation of personal viewpoints regarding social phenomena. For instance, in the utterance, “Dan saya enggak setuju tentang statement dia soal tukang parkir enggak jelas” (“And I disagree with his statement about unclear parking attendants”), the speaker directly conveys their stance.

Assertive type IA.2 (informing) appeared with a frequency of 14.11%, indicating that the speakers not only expressed personal opinions but also provided information or clarification regarding the issues discussed. One example includes references to articles in the Anti-Corruption Law (Undang-Undang Tipikor). This function highlights the podcast's dual role as both entertainment and an educational platform for its audience.

Other assertive types found include complaining (2.58%) and claiming (0.45%). Complaints reflect dissatisfaction with certain social conditions, while claims express a speaker's conviction regarding specific matters. Meanwhile, the boasting type was not found, suggesting that the speakers consistently maintained credibility when expressing their views.

Directive speech acts were also notably present, especially type IDR.3 (questioning), with a frequency of 14.42%. Questions were used to elicit responses or reflections from interlocutors or the audience. Other directive types identified include commanding (6.07%), suggesting (3.64%), and inviting (0.61%). The absence of

requesting speech acts indicates that the discussions occurred on an equal footing, free from hierarchical power dynamics.

Expressive speech acts were also prominent, particularly those used for criticizing or teasing (5.31%) and praising (3.34%). These illustrate a dynamic yet respectful communication style throughout the discussion. Gratitude (2.28%) and apologies (0.30%) also appeared, reflecting politeness and mutual respect among the speakers. However, congratulatory expressions were not found, which may be due to the podcast's focus on issue-based and analytical content rather than personal achievements or celebratory occasions.

Commissive speech acts were found in very low frequency, only 0.61%, comprising promises and oaths. The absence of offers and threats suggests that the nature of the discussion was informative and reflective rather than persuasive or confrontational. Lastly, declarative speech acts of the "deciding" type appeared with a frequency of 1.23%. These typically occurred when the moderator made decisions to guide the flow of discussion. Other declarative types—such as permitting, punishing, or dismissing—were not identified, likely due to the informal and egalitarian context of the podcast, where no official authority or institutional power was present.

The following are illocutionary speech acts identified in two episodes of the *Ruang 28* podcast, titled "*Mamat Korupsi, Cania dan Gilbhas Cepu-in ke KPK*" and "*Pandji Pragiwaksono Vs David Nurbianto: Siapa yang Cocok Jadi Pejabat?!*," published on the Noice YouTube channel. The classification is based on their communicative functions.

Assertive Speech Acts

According to Cawood (as cited in Apriansah, 2023, p. 198), assertive behavior can be defined as an expression that reflects the speaker's thoughts, feelings, needs, or rights in an honest, direct, and appropriate manner, without unfounded fear or anxiety. Assertive speech acts, also known as representative acts, are used to express truths or propositions to which the speaker commits. These acts include functions such as stating, informing, complaining, claiming, boasting, and others.

Stating

The function of stating is used to clearly express ideas, thoughts, opinions, or feelings. The purpose of this function is to convey the speaker's belief in a truth so that the hearer can consider and possibly accept the viewpoint presented.

"Dalam pengamatan saya, sebenarnya kita tidak perlu tukang parkir, karena kita perlu tukang tilang. Jadi, aturannya jelaskan aja, ikuti aturannya, yang enggak ngikutin ditilang." (Data 57 E.TP)

("In my observation, we actually don't need parking attendants, because what we need are traffic enforcers. So, just make the rules clear, follow the rules, and those who don't follow should get fined.")

The utterance in data 57 E.TP represents an assertive illocutionary act of type IA.1 (stating). In this example, the speaker conveys a personal viewpoint based on observation, suggesting that parking attendants are unnecessary, and what is truly needed are law enforcement officers, such as traffic police. The speaker asserts how the system should operate—by enforcing clear rules and penalizing violations—without relying on informal parking attendants. This utterance reflects an assertive speech act because it



communicates a belief or personal opinion in a clear, informative, and argumentative manner.

Informing

The function of informing is to convey new information to the hearer—something previously unknown to them. This function is often used to communicate important news or facts, whether in formal or informal contexts.

"Diberitakan pada Mei 2024 bahwa tukang parkir liar akan diseleksi oleh beberapa pemprov atau penda untuk dijadikan karyawan." (Data 85 E.TP)

("It was reported in May 2024 that illegal parking attendants would be selected by several provincial or local governments to become official employees.")

The utterance in data 85 E.TP represents an assertive illocutionary act of type IA.2 (informing), as it is used by the speaker to provide information to the hearer. In this context, the speaker shares a piece of news from May 2024, stating that illegal parking attendants will be selected by several provincial or local governments to be formally employed. This utterance serves to inform the interlocutor, allowing them to process and potentially consider the information within the discussion.

Complaining

The function of complaining is defined as an expression of the speaker's emotional response to a particular situation. Complaint utterances typically convey the speaker's dissatisfaction, frustration, discomfort, pain, or disappointment regarding an experience or condition.

"Simpelnya kayak gitu sih. Pelayanan, kan sering tuh kita kalau dengar orang tulisannya 'loket buka jam delapan', tapi kita datang jam delapan pas, kok belum pada buka? Atau istirahat sampai jam satu tulisannya, belum datang dia. Itu kan juga jadi gimana kita. Pelayanan publik judulnya, tapi kayak gitu." (Data 274 E.K)

("It's that simple, really. Public service—you know, we often see signs that say 'counter opens at eight', but when we arrive right at eight, they're still not open. Or it says the break ends at one, but they haven't returned yet. That kind of thing makes us wonder. It's called public service, but look at how it actually is.")

The utterance in Data 274 E.K represents an assertive illocutionary act of type IA.3 (complaining). In this case, the speaker, Gilbhas, expresses dissatisfaction with public service performance by providing a concrete example—government service counters not operating according to their stated hours. Through a casual tone, the speaker voices public frustration over the lack of punctuality in public service. The statement "*Pelayanan publik judulnya, tapi kayak gitu*" ("It's called public service, but look at that") reinforces the complaint being made.

Claiming

The function of claiming is to convey information while simultaneously asserting recognition or ownership over a particular statement or position. Venderveken (as cited in Yasen, C., 2021) states that a claim is similar to a statement, but it places greater emphasis on affirming ownership or authority over the content being conveyed.

"Saya bisa jawab." (Data 195 E.TP)
(*"I believe I can answer that."*)

The utterance in Data 195 E.TP represents an assertive illocutionary act of type IA.4 (claiming). This utterance reflects the speaker's confidence in their ability to respond to the topic being discussed. In this context, the speaker is not only expressing readiness to answer but also making a claim regarding their competence or authority to address the issue at hand.

Directive Speech Acts

Directive speech acts refer to utterances intended to influence the hearer to perform a specific action, in accordance with the speaker's request, instruction, or direction. This type of speech act includes functions such as commanding, suggesting, questioning, requesting, inviting, and others.

Commanding

According to Prayitno (as cited in Alkatiri, D., 2021), directive speech acts in the form of commands aim to direct or instruct the hearer to carry out an action in line with the speaker's intention. The goal of this utterance is to elicit a response from the hearer, either through action or verbal acknowledgment.

"Tepuk tangan dulu, penontonnya!" (Data 2 E.TP)
(*"Applause first, audience!"*)

The utterance in Data 2 E.TP is categorized as a directive illocutionary act of type IDR.1 (commanding). In this instance, the speaker issues a direct command to the hearers, instructing them to applaud. Although delivered in a light, informal tone typical of entertainment contexts, the main function remains directive, as it seeks a specific action from the audience.

Suggesting

According to Anani and Tressyalina (2023, p. 132), suggesting is a type of directive speech act in which the speaker offers an opinion or proposal to the hearer, intending to encourage the hearer to take a certain action as implied by the speaker.

"Kita harus revisi undang-undang itu, kayaknya harus ada batas." (Data 154 E.K)
(*"We should revise that law; there should probably be a limit."*)

The utterance in Data 154 E.K is classified as a directive speech act of type IDR.2 (suggesting), as it functions as a recommendation directed toward the relevant parties to consider revising the law. The use of the word "harus" ("should") emphasizes the speaker's intention to urge consideration of the proposed action.

Questioning

According to Searle (as cited in Widowati, 2023), questioning is classified as a directive speech act because it contains a request from the speaker for the hearer to respond with a speech act that aligns with the context of the question posed.



"Gimana, gimana ceritanya nih?" (Data 55 E.K)

("So, what's the story here?")

The utterance in Data 55 E.K is categorized as a directive illocutionary act of type IDR.3 (questioning), as it reflects the speaker's intention to prompt a verbal response from the hearer based on the given context. The interrogative word *gimana* (how) functions to ask about the manner, condition, or clarity of an event or situation. In this case, the speaker (Kania) is asking her interlocutor (Indra) for an explanation regarding how he has managed to remain at the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) from the beginning until the present.

Inviting

According to the sixth edition of the *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI), *mengajak* (to invite) refers to encouraging someone to engage in a particular action. Therefore, an invitational directive can be understood as an utterance that aims to stir the hearer's willingness to carry out the action suggested by the speaker.

"Huuuh! Sekarang ayo semuanya!" (Data 60 E.TP)

("Huuuh! Now, everyone, let's go!")

The utterance in Data 60 E.TP is classified as a directive illocutionary act of type IDR.5 (inviting), in which the speaker (Pandji) calls on the audience to join in shouting "huuuh." In this context, Pandji extends his hand, gesturing to invite audience participation. The physical gesture reinforces the verbal cue, indicating that the speaker is actively encouraging the audience to respond and take part in the action. The use of the word *ayo* ("let's") is a common form of invitation in everyday Indonesian that signals a collective call to action.

Commissive Speech Acts

Commissive speech acts are utterances in which the speaker expresses an intention or commitment to perform a future action. Wahyuni (2021, p. 234) emphasizes that commissive acts are binding in nature, as the speaker explicitly states their commitment to carrying out the proposed action. This type of illocution includes acts such as promising, swearing, offering, and threatening.

Promising

A commissive speech act in the form of a promise involves the speaker expressing an intention to fulfill a particular action, thereby signaling a commitment to the hearer. The function of this illocution is to convey the speaker's willingness to carry out the promised act.

"Aku belum coba. Nanti aku beli, deh." (Data 11 E.K)

("I haven't tried it yet. I'll buy it later.")

The utterance in Data 11 E.K represents a commissive illocutionary act of type IK.1 (promising), as the speaker (Kania) expresses her intention to purchase and try what the interlocutor had previously recommended—*Lo Kuan Ho*, a remedy for cough. Kania conveys her commitment to act in the future, indicating that she will follow the suggestion made by Gilbhas.

Swearing

Swearing as a commissive act can be understood as an utterance in which the speaker makes a serious commitment to uphold the truth or remain loyal to something. This type of utterance morally and socially binds the speaker to fulfill the claim through future action.

"Makanya saya enggak mau jadi pejabat, sumpah enggak mau masuk politik." (Data 267 E.K)

("That's why I don't want to be an official—I swear I won't go into politics.")

The utterance in Data 267 E.K represents a commissive speech act in the form of swearing, as the speaker (Mamat) declares a personal commitment not to engage in political life. The use of the word *sumpah* ("I swear") serves as a clear linguistic marker of the speaker's binding intention regarding a future course of action.

Expressive Speech Acts

According to Pratama and Utomo (2020, p. 95), expressive speech acts serve as a medium for speakers to express emotions or feelings directed at the hearer, usually based on a particular situation or condition. Examples of expressive speech acts include praising, criticizing or teasing, thanking, apologizing, congratulating, and so on.

Praising

Praising is characterized by the speaker's expression of appreciation, admiration, or positive evaluation toward the hearer or another individual.

"Ah, cocok! Luar biasa, keren." (Data 315 E.K)

("Ah, fitting! Outstanding, cool.")

The utterance in Data 315 E.K is classified as an expressive illocutionary act of type IE.1 (praising), as the speaker, Indra, expresses admiration toward Mamat's statement that recognizing one's imperfection is itself a form of honesty. Indra describes Mamat's perspective as "cool" and "outstanding," showing approval and admiration—core features of expressive acts of praise.

Criticizing/Teasing (Irony or Sarcasm)

Expressive speech acts of teasing or criticizing are typically used when the speaker expresses disapproval indirectly. This may stem from dissatisfaction with the hearer's behavior or speech, or as a form of implicit criticism often conveyed through irony or rhetorical questions.

"Pejabat kita. Ngaku tegak lurus, tapi belok-belok. Apaan, konstitusi dilanggar."

("Our officials. Claim to be straight, but always bend. What is this—violating the constitution?") (Data 79 E.TP)

The utterance in Data 79 E.TP is an expressive speech act of type IE.2 (teasing/sarcasm), as it conveys implicit criticism of government officials. The contrast between "straight" and "bending" highlights inconsistency and hypocrisy in political behavior. This ironic style is common in social critique, conveying dissatisfaction in a



subtle yet sharp manner. Hence, this is not a factual statement, but a form of expressive irony aimed at mocking perceived inconsistencies.

Thanking

Thanking typically arises when the hearer fulfills a request, gives praise, or offers kindness. Its functions to show gratitude and appreciation for the positive action received.

"Terima kasih Pak Indra atas waktunya." (Data 357 E.K)
(“Thank you, Mr. Indra, for your time.”)

The utterance in Data 357 E.K, spoken by Kania, is an expressive illocutionary act of type IE.3 (thanking). Here, Kania explicitly expresses gratitude for the time Mr. Indra has provided to participate in the discussion with her and her colleagues.

Apologizing

Apologizing is an expressive act used to convey regret for a mistake or offense. It typically occurs when the speaker acknowledges an error and attempts to repair the social relationship with the hearer (Wiwaha, 2021).

"Oh, waduh, kalau gitu, teman-teman saya yang PNS, sorry ya, saya enggak mau nraktir lagi, ya. Sorry, sorry, saya enggak mau, daripada salah nanti, ya." (Data 63 E.K)
(“Oh no, in that case, to my civil servant friends—sorry, I won’t be treating you anymore. Sorry, sorry, I won’t, just to be safe.”) (Data 63 E.K)

The utterance in Data 63 E.K is classified as an expressive illocutionary act of type IE.4 (apologizing). In this context, the speaker (Gilbhas) apologizes to his civil servant friends, expressing concern over the potential impropriety of continuing to treat them. The repeated use of “sorry” emphasizes the sincerity of his apology. The utterance serves not only as an apology but also as a clarification of his intentions to avoid misunderstandings and potential ethical issues.

Declarative Speech Acts

Declarative speech acts are a type of utterance that functions to establish, validate, or change a particular condition or state through the act of speaking. This type of illocution is considered special because it can only be performed by individuals who possess a certain level of authority within an institution or formal social context. Declarative acts often result in changes to social or institutional status, such as permitting, deciding, punishing, or dismissing someone.

Deciding

The declarative act of deciding refers to a type of utterance in which the speaker makes a decision that results in an immediate change of status or condition.

"Boleh sekarang yang mulai jawab dari Bapak David dulu." (Data 132 E.TP)
(“Let’s have Mr. David answer first.”) (Data 132 E.TP)

The utterance in Data 132 E.TP is classified as a declarative illocutionary act of type IDK.2 (deciding). In this context, the speaker, Gilbhas, is acting as the moderator of the discussion and therefore holds the authority to determine the speaking order. Through

this utterance, he establishes the sequence of turns in the conversation, which constitutes a decision that influences the structure of the discussion.

Several other subtypes of speech acts—such as assertive (boasting), directive (requesting), commissive (offering and threatening), and declarative (permitting, punishing, and dismissing)—were not identified in the dataset. This absence indicates that these forms of speech acts were not contextually relevant in the two podcast episodes analyzed.

Based on the overall data, the dominance of assertive speech acts—particularly those expressing statements and providing information—indicates that the discussions in the *Ruang 28* podcast are informative, reflective, and oriented toward raising social awareness. The conversational style, which is relaxed, dialogic, and interspersed with humor, allows social criticism to be delivered in a light yet meaningful manner. Directive and expressive speech acts further enhance the dynamics of the conversation by incorporating emotional responses and encouraging active participation among speakers.

The use of speech acts in *Ruang 28* illustrates that language functions not only as a tool for communication but also as a medium for conveying social critique and fostering collective awareness through argumentative dialogue. This demonstrates the potential of podcasts as an authentic and meaningful form of communication in everyday life.

These findings are particularly relevant for Indonesian language learning, especially in the context of teaching discussion texts at the junior high school level. In reading and viewing activities, students need to be trained to comprehend and interpret information, opinions, and messages from both spoken and audiovisual texts. Excerpts from podcasts can be effectively utilized by teachers as instructional stimuli to introduce linguistic functions and the variety of speech acts in discussion texts, to develop students' ability to interpret utterances in real-life contexts, and to encourage the production of discussion texts aligned with their communicative purposes.

CONCLUSION

Out of the 659 speech acts analyzed, assertive speech acts—particularly the types of stating and informing—were found to be the most dominant, followed by directive and expressive acts. These findings reflect the character of the discussion as open, argumentative, and reflective, addressing social issues in a relaxed yet substantive manner.

The communication patterns in the podcast demonstrate that the speakers are not merely expressing opinions, but also fostering dialogue, clarification, social critique, and active participation. The types of speech acts used highlight the function of language as a means of conveying perspectives, expressing attitudes, and fostering collective awareness of social issues.

These findings have implications for Indonesian language instruction at the junior high school level, particularly in teaching discussion texts. Podcast excerpts can serve as authentic learning materials to introduce linguistic functions, train reading and listening comprehension skills, and encourage students to produce discussion texts by practicing various speech acts in a contextual and communicative manner.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude to Dr. Reni Nur Eriyani, M.Pd., and Rahmah Purwahida, S.Pd., M.Hum., for their invaluable guidance, direction, motivation, and knowledge throughout the research process. Appreciation is also



extended to all parties who contributed to the smooth conduct of this research, both directly and indirectly. This study was conducted as part of the final project for the Bachelor's Degree Program in Indonesian Language and Literature Education at Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdussamad, Z. (2021). *Qualitative Research Methods*. Syakir Media Press.
- Alkatiri, D. (2021). Directive Speech Acts in the Novel *Ayah* by Andrea Hirata. *Tunas: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 7(1), 1–8.
<http://journal umpalangkaraya.ac.id/index.php/tunas>
- Anani, S. S., & Tressyalina, T. (2023). Directive Speech Acts by Indy Rahmawati in the Talk Show *Satu Jam Lebih Dekat* on TVOne. *Jurnal Idiomatik: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 127–137.
<https://ejournals.umma.ac.id/index.php/idiomatik/article/view/1664>
- Apriansah, R. N. (2023). Assertive Speech Acts in the Novel *CADL* by Triskaidekaman. *Jurnal Bastra*, 8(2), 196–203. <http://bastra.uho.ac.id/index.php/jurnal>
- Chaer, A. (2014). *General Linguistics*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Kentary, A., Ngalm, A., & Prayitno, H. J. (2015). Illocutionary Speech Acts of Javanese Cultural Background Teachers: A Gender Perspective. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 16(1), <https://doi.org/10.23917/humaniora.v16i1.1522>
- Pratama, R. K., & Utomo, A. P. Y. (2020). Analysis of Expressive Speech Acts in *Stand Up Comedy Indonesia* Season 3 by Babe Cabita on Kompas TV. *Caraka*, 6(2), 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.30738/v6i2.7841>
- Setiawati, E., & Arista, H. D. (2018). *Tools for Understanding Communication in Interactional Discourse: A Pragmatic Study*. Universitas Brawijaya Press.
- Wahyuni, A. (2021). Commissive Speech Acts among Merchants at the Krueng Geukuh Public Market, Dewantara Subdistrict, North Aceh Regency (A Pragmatic Study). *Kande: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(2), 231–239. <https://doi.org/10.29103/jk.v2i2.5468>
- Widowati, Z. N. (2023). Directive Speech Acts in the *Pas Buka* Talk Show on the YouTube Channel Trans 7 Official. *Nuansa Indonesia*, 25(1).
<https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/ni>
- Wiwaha, R. S. R., Andajani, K., & Harsiati, T. (2021). Expressive Speech Acts in Indonesian Language Learning Videos. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya (e-Journal)*, 7(2), 335–352.
<https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v7i2.17591>
- Yasen, C. (2021). Assertive Illocutionary Speech Acts in the TV Series *Breaking Bad* Season 1: A Pragmatic Study (Doctoral dissertation, Undergraduate English Study Program, Faculty of Languages, Universitas Widyatama).