

FORMS OF DIRECTIVE ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS FROM THE MAIN CHARACTER IN TWELVE ANGRY MEN (1957) MOVIE

***Kevin Setiawan¹, Juanda²**

Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Komputer Indonesia,
Jl. Dipati Ukur 112-116, Bandung, Indonesia
kevin.63720047@mahasiswa.unikom.ac.id

ABSTRACT

As a popular form of mass media, film effectively conveys the realities of society through the interactions between characters within its storyline. This means it can serve as an object of study in language sciences. In pragmatics, every utterance carries a hidden meaning depending on the context, including the action, known as a speech act. Speech acts can also be found in films, such as *Twelve Angry Men* (1957). This study focuses on the utterances of the film's main character. The objective is to identify the types and forms of directive speech acts using the pragmatic identity method and the pragmatic competence-in-equalizing technique. The research identified three forms of directive acts: declarative, imperative, and interrogative, with interrogative being the most used. These acts are used for several purpose, including suggestions, questions, requests, commands, prohibitions, and reminds.

Keywords: Film, Pragmatics, Directive Speech Acts

INTRODUCTION

Communication is an essential part of everyday human life, serving as a way for people to exchange information and ideas to better understand each other and work together. Thanks to advances in technology, communication can happen not only face-to-face but also indirectly through various media (Frاندika, 2020). Communication media are generally divided into two types: non-mass media, which deliver information to a single recipient, such as telephone and fax, and mass media, which reach a much wider audience (Ghassani, 2019). One example of mass media is audiovisual media such as films.

As a popular form of mass media, films play an important role in delivering messages to viewers by combining different technologies such as photography and sound recording, along with various art forms including visual arts, theater, literature, architecture, and music (Effendy, 1986). Films are not only a source of entertainment but also serve as tools for education, propaganda, and social reflection, influencing public opinion and attitudes. Through dialogues, scenes, and narratives, films can portray complex and realistic communication situations, reflecting social realities (Ghassani, 2019). Because of this, films are often studied in many fields, especially linguistics, including its branch that study the practical aspects of human action and thought, pragmatics (Juanda, 2021).

In pragmatics, the meaning of language is closely tied to the context and situation in which the language is used (Sutedi, 2008). When someone speaks, they are not just

saying words but also performing actions (Hamidah, 2022). This is what we call a speech act.

Speech acts are important because they show how utterances do more than just convey information—they also serve specific purposes and have effects in social interactions. According to Leech (1983), every utterance involves three types of acts simultaneously: locutionary acts, which are about the actual content of the speech; perlocutionary acts, which focus on the effect the speech has on the listener; and illocutionary acts, which concern the speaker's intention beyond the literal meaning (Wisnu, 2022). Illocutionary acts are further divided into five types based on their purpose: directive, assertive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

Directive illocutionary acts specifically aim to guide or influence the listener to do something according to the speaker's wishes (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985). These include commands, requests, prohibitions, and invitations, which can be expressed directly or indirectly (Prayitno, 2017). Directive speech acts also come in different forms of utterances, categorized as interrogative (questions), declarative (statements), and imperative (commands) (Kreidler, 1998). Analyzing these forms in detail can provide deeper insights into the communication strategies people use in various social and cultural settings, including in mass media like films.

Previous research has examined speech acts in visual media. For example, Ulin Intan Saputri (2020) conducted a study titled *Analysis of Directive Speech Acts in the Dialogue of the Film "Rembulan Tenggelam Di Wajahmu"* by Tere Liye. This study aimed to describe the types of directive speech acts in the film's dialogue based on Prayitno's (2017) theory. The findings identified ten examples of directive speech acts: two commands, two requests, two invitations, two pieces of advice, and two prohibitions. Unlike that study, the current research uses Yule's (1996) classification to analyze directive speech acts and also focuses on a different film, *Twelve Angry Men* (1957).

Released on April 10, 1957, *Twelve Angry Men* tells the story of twelve jurors who gather in a deliberation room to decide the fate of a teenager accused of murdering his father. At first, almost all jurors believe the defendant is guilty. However, one juror, known as Juror 8, begins to question the evidence. Through intense discussions and debates, each juror must confront their personal biases, moral values, and sense of justice. The inner conflicts and sharp arguments gradually change most jurors' initial opinions, challenging common assumptions and highlighting the importance of critical thinking and the courage to question what seems obvious. The researcher chose this film because it shows how Juror 8, the main character, persuades the other jurors to reconsider their judgments. Therefore, the study focuses on the main character's utterances during his interactions with the other jurors. The results are expected to significantly enhance the understanding of speech act theory and its application in film as a rich and dynamic form of communication.

METHODS

This research uses a qualitative approach to study social phenomena (Creswell, 2007). The data comes directly from the subject being studied—in this case, the film *Twelve Angry Men*. To collect data, the researcher gathers facts and analyzes them using Searle's (1969) theory. The focus of the analysis is on directive speech acts and their different types of forms, based on Kreidler's (1998) classification. Following Sudaryanto's (2015) observational approach, the researcher first downloads the script of *Twelve Angry*

Men (1957) from the internet. Then, by reading the script and watching the film multiple times, the researcher gains a clear understanding of the context and situations in which the main character interacts with others. The researcher collects the main character's statements related to directive speech acts and groups them according to Yule's categories.

This study also applies the pragmatic identity method introduced by Sudaryanto (2015), which uses context to identify and analyze data. The researcher matches the data and organizes the analysis based on Searle's (1969) theory. The process involves several steps: first, understanding the context of each statement by looking at the scenes in the film, which serve as the data source. Next, the researcher explains the order of the dialogue based on its context. Then, each statement is compared with its context to find out the meaning intended by the speaker. Finally, the conclusions and findings from the analysis are written clearly in sentences and paragraphs.

RESULTS

The function of directive illocutionary acts is to get the listener to do specific actions. In Twelve Angry Men movie, Juror 8 as the main character, uses various forms of directive acts during his conversation with other jurors for various purposes. The data was taken from both video and script of Twelve Angry Men movie. The research got 83 data.

Table 1. Directed Acts Forms In the Main Character's Utterances

No.	The Forms of Directive Acts	Frequency
1.	Declarative	7
2.	Imperative	60
3.	Interrogative	16
Total		83

DISCUSSION

There are 84 utterances from Juror 8 as the main character of this movie, that are directive acts. For this discussion, the researcher only analyses 12 utterances, 4 from each form. Research found four data of declarative form in data 1, 3, 4, and 5. Imperative form was discovered five data in data 2, 7, 11, and 12. Interrogative form had five data as found in data 6, 8, 9, and 10

Data 1

Foreman : One. Right. Okay, eleven to one, guilty. Now we know where we are.

Juror 10 : Boy-oh-boy. There's always one.

Juror 7 : So what do we do now?

Juror 8 : **Well, I guess we talk. (declarative)**

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:11:39 – 00:11:52)

This dialogue occurs at an early moment in the film Twelve Angry Men, when Juror 1, the foreman, initiates a vote to determine whether the defendant is guilty of murdering his father. Almost all jurors vote "guilty," except for Juror 8, who stands alone in his doubt. According to the jury's rules, the verdict must be unanimous, so the

deliberation cannot end until all jurors agree on a decision. This requirement sets the stage for a tense and prolonged discussion. When Juror 7, frustrated by the delay, asks, “So what do we do now?” it reveals the impatience and pressure felt by many jurors who want to conclude the case quickly. Juror 8 only replies, “Well, I guess we talk,” which is a declarative form of directive act.

The sentence “Well, I guess we talk,” is a declarative form of directive act. A declarative sentence typically states a fact, opinion, or belief. However, in this context, Juror 8 uses a declarative form to issue a subtle directive—he is effectively suggesting that the group continue their discussion rather than rushing to judgment. This indirect way of giving a directive softens the command, making it less confrontational and more collaborative. Instead of telling the jurors what to do outright, Juror 8 invites them to engage in dialogue, encouraging openness and reflection.

Data 2

Juror 7 : What's the difference how long it takes? We honestly think he's guilty. So supposing we finish in five minutes? So what?

Juror 8 : Let's take an hour. The ball game doesn't start till eight o'clock. (imperative)

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:13:09 – 00:13:15)

This conversation takes place just before the jurors begin their formal deliberation on the defendant's final verdict. Juror 7 expresses his frustration about the situation, complaining that he won't be able to leave early to watch a baseball game he's looking forward to. His impatience is clear when he questions the point of prolonging the discussion over a case whose outcome seems obvious to him—that the defendant is guilty. He says, “What's the difference how long it takes? We honestly think he's guilty. So supposing we finish in five minutes? So what?” This reflects a common human tendency to want quick resolutions, especially when one believes the answer is already clear.

Juror 8 responds calmly with, “Let's take an hour. The ball game doesn't start till eight o'clock.” This statement is an imperative sentence, which is typically used to give commands, make requests, or offer suggestions. In this case, Juror 8 is gently suggesting that Juror 7—and by extension, the whole jury—give the deliberation just one more hour. By framing it this way, Juror 8 is not only proposing a reasonable amount of time to reconsider the case but also reassuring Juror 7 that he will still have time to watch the game afterward. Rather than confronting Juror 7's impatience with direct opposition or argument, Juror 8 acknowledges his concern and offers a compromise. This approach helps to reduce tension and resistance, encouraging cooperation without forcing it.

Data 3

Juror 9 : I'm willing to sit for an hour.

Juror 10 : Great. I heard a pretty good story last night...

Juror 8 : That's not what we're sitting here for! (declarative)

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:13:24 – 0:13:30)

This dialogue takes place at the very beginning of the jury's meeting. It shows a contrast in attitudes among the jurors: for example, Juror 9 expresses enthusiasm and readiness to engage in the discussion, saying, “I'm willing to sit for an hour.” On the other hand, Juror 10 chooses to spend his time telling stories that are unrelated to the main

purpose of their gathering (“Great. I heard a pretty good story last night...”). Juror 8 interrupts Juror 10’s off-topic remarks by firmly stating, “That’s not what we’re sitting here for!”

This utterance is an example of a declarative speech act. In this statement, Juror 8 clearly expresses his opinion that the jurors have come together to discuss something important, not to pass time or engage in irrelevant chatter. Although Juror 8’s words do not explicitly forbid Juror 10 from continuing, the tone and context imply a subtle prohibition—an indirect way of telling Juror 10 to stay focused on the task at hand.

Data 4

Juror 10 : All right, then you tell me. What are we sitting here for?
Juror 8 : **Maybe for no reason. I don't know. Look, this boy's been kicked around all his life. You know, living in a slum, his mother dead since he was nine. He spent a year and a half in an orphanage while his father served a jail term for forgery. That's not a very good headstart. He's a wild, angry kid and that's all he's ever been. You know why he got that way? Because he was knocked on the head by somebody once a day, every day. He's had a pretty terrible nineteen years. I think maybe we owe him a few words. That's all. (declarative)**

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:13:31 – 00:14:06)

In this dialogue, Juror 10 questions why Juror 8 disagrees with the majority of the other jurors, forcing them to be stuck in the jury room discussing the defendant’s verdict (“All right, then you tell me. What are we sitting here for?”). Juror 8 then explains his reasons by sharing the defendant’s tough background (“...this boy's been kicked around all his life. You know, living in a slum, his mother dead since he was nine. He spent a year and a half in an orphanage while his father served a jail term for forgery. That's not a very good head start. You know why he got that way? Because he was knocked on the head by somebody once a day, every day. He's had a pretty terrible nineteen years.”). Because of this, he believes they should give the young man a fair chance at justice (“I think maybe we owe him a few words. That's all.”).

Juror 8’s statement is a declarative directive speech act. He not only presents facts about the defendant’s background but also expresses his opinion, suggesting others to pay closer attention to the young man’s case instead of hastily handing down a death sentence.

Data 5

Foreman : That sounds all right. In order, a couple minutes apiece. (To #2) I guess you're first.
Juror 2 : Oh. Well... Well it's hard to put into words. I just... think he's guilty. I thought it was obvious from the word go. I mean nobody proved otherwise.
Juror 8 : **Nobody has to prove otherwise. The burden of proof is on the prosecution. The defendant doesn't have to open his mouth. That's in the Constitution. You've heard of it. (declarative)**
Juror 2 : (flustered) Well sure I've heard of it. I know what it is. I... what I meant... well the man is guilty. I mean some body saw him do it.

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:15:37 – 00:16:09)

This dialogue takes place when all eleven jurors begin to present their arguments one by one to convince Juror 8 that the defendant is indeed guilty. The first to speak is Juror 2, who simply states that the defendant is guilty because no one has proven otherwise (“I just... think he's guilty. I thought it was obvious from the word go. I mean nobody proved otherwise.”). Juror 8 then responds by saying that there is nothing wrong with that because it is the prosecution’s responsibility to prove guilt, which Juror 2 should already know (“The burden of proof is on the prosecution. The defendant doesn't have to open his mouth. That's in the Constitution. You've heard of it.”).

Juror 8’s directive speech act in this dialogue is declarative because he states a fact about court procedure and the role of the prosecution. The purpose of Juror 8’s statement is to remind Juror 2 of something he should already be aware of (“You've heard of it.”), implying that Juror 2 should not use the lack of proof as an argument against the defendant.

Data 6

Juror 10 : Here's a woman who's lying in bed and can't sleep. She's dying with the heat. Know what I mean? Anyway, she looks out the window and right across the street she sees the kid stick the knife into his father. The time is 12:10 on the nose. Everything fits. Look, she's known the kid all his life. His window is right opposite hers, across the el tracks, and she swore she saw him do it.

Juror 8 : Through the windows of a passing elevated train.

Juror 10 : Right. This el train had no passengers on it. It was just being moved downtown. The lights were out, remember? And they proved in court that at night you can look through the windows of an el train when the lights are out and see what's happening on the other side. They proved it!

Juror 8 : I'd like to ask you something. You don't believe the boy. How come you believe the woman? She's one of "them" too, isn't she? (interrogative)

Juror 10 : You're a pretty smart fellow, aren't you?

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:17:21 – 00:18:18)

This dialogue takes place when the jurors are discussing the eyewitness testimony of a woman who lives in the same neighborhood as the defendant. In her testimony, she claims to have seen the defendant stab his father at midnight (“...she looks out the window and right across the street she sees the kid stick the knife into his father. The time is 12:10 on the nose. Everything fits.”). Juror 10 believes this testimony is enough to prove the defendant’s guilt. However, Juror 8 asks him, “You don't believe the boy. How come you believe the woman? She's one of 'them' too, isn't she?”

Juror 8’s statement is a directive speech act in the form of an interrogative because it ends with a question mark (?) and is used to question the other speaker. Through this utterance, Juror 8 challenges Juror 10’s judgment, questioning why he trusts the eyewitness’s testimony more than the defendant’s own words, even though both come from the same neighborhood, which Juror 10 considers to be an immoral area.

Data 7

- Foreman : All right, let's stop all this arguing. We're wasting time here. (pointing to Juror 8) It's your turn. Let's go.
- Juror 8 : Well, I didn't expect a turn. I thought you were all supposed to be convincing me. Wasn't that the idea? (*interrogative*)**
- Juror 12 : Check. That was the idea.
- Foreman : I forgot about that. He's right.

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:22:49 – 00:22:57)

In this dialogue, the jury foreman turns to Juror 8 and asks him to present his argument for the defendant's not guilty vote ("It's your turn. Let's go."). However, instead of complying, Juror 8 expresses surprise at the request and responds with a question: "I thought you were all supposed to be convincing me. Wasn't that the idea?"

Juror 8's utterance here is a directive speech act in the form of an interrogative, as he is asking something of his interlocutor. He questions the sudden change in the foreman's decision because, before the jury meeting began, they had agreed that only the jurors who voted guilty would present their arguments, hoping to persuade Juror 8 ("I thought you were all supposed to be convincing me."). Through this statement, Juror 8 is reminding the group of their initial agreement, assuming that the foreman had forgotten it, which the foreman then confirms by saying, "I forgot about that."

Data 8

- Juror 3 : Okay what about the knife? You know, the one that fine upright boy admitted buying on the night of the murder. Let's talk about that.
- Juror 8 : All right. Let's talk about it. Let's get it in here and look at it. I'd like to see it again. Mr. Foreman? (*imperative*)**

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:25:51 – 00:26:01)

In this dialogue, Juror 3 suggests examining one of the pieces of evidence, namely the switchblade knife that the defendant bought on the night the murder occurred ("Okay, what about the knife? You know, the one that fine upright boy admitted buying on the night of the murder."). This same knife is also the weapon that killed the defendant's father, so Juror 3 considers it important to inspect it again ("Let's talk about that."). Juror 8 agrees with the suggestion and asks for the knife to be brought into the jury room ("Let's get it in here and look at it. I'd like to see it again.").

Juror 8's utterance in this dialogue is categorized as a directive speech act in the form of an imperative. This is because the utterance aims to give a command or request for the listener to do what the speaker asks. In this example, Juror 8 is asking someone to bring the switchblade, and he specifically directs this request to the jury foreman ("Mr. Foreman?").

Data 9

- Juror 6 : You think he's not guilty?
- Juror 8 : I don't know. It's possible.
- Juror 6 : I don't know you, but I'm bettin' you've never been wronger in your life. Y'oughta wrap it up. You're wastin' your time.
- Juror 8 : Supposing you were the one on trial? (*interrogative*)**

Juror 6 : I'm not used to supposing. I'm just a working man. My boss does the supposing. But I'll try one. Supposing you talk us all outa this, and the kid really did knife his father?

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:38:35 – 00:39:05)

This dialogue takes place in the jury room restroom during a break before the meeting resumes. Juror 8 is approached by Juror 6, who is curious about Juror 8's persistence in standing his ground. Juror 6 tries to persuade him to give up, saying that all this arguing is just a waste of time ("Y'oughta wrap it up. You're wastin' your time"). In response, Juror 8 simply asks, "Supposing you were the one on trial?"

Juror 8's utterance here is a directive speech act in the form of an interrogative because it ends with a question mark and demands an answer from the interlocutor. Juror 8 intends to make Juror 6 imagine himself in the defendant's position, implying that deciding a verdict of life or death is not something to be taken lightly or dismissed as a waste of time.

Data 10

Juror 8 : Who's got a watch with a second hand? (*interrogative*)

Juror 2 : I have.

Juror 8 : When you want me to start, stamp your foot. That'll be the body falling. Time me from there.

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:57:03 – 00:57:08)

This dialogue takes place when the jurors are discussing the testimony of a limping man who claims to have witnessed the murder. Juror 8 doubts this testimony because the man's limp should have made it impossible for him to get up from bed and leave the house quickly enough to see the event. To test this, Juror 8 reenacts the scenario by pretending to be the witness and tries to measure the actual time it would take for someone walking with a limp. To get an accurate result, he asks if anyone among the jurors has a watch with a second hand ("Who's got a watch with a second hand?").

The directive speech act made by Juror 8 is in the form of an interrogative sentence because the speaker is asking a question expecting an answer from the listener. In this case, Juror 8 is not just asking if someone has a watch, but also implicitly requesting that person's willingness to lend the watch to him.

Data 11

Juror 8 : Who's got a watch with a second hand?

Juror 2 : I have.

Juror 8 : When you want me to start, stamp your foot. That'll be the body falling. Time me from there. (*imperative*)

(Twelve Angry Men, 00:57:03 – 00:57:08)

This dialogue takes place when the jurors are discussing the testimony of a limping man who claims to have witnessed the murder. Juror 8 doubts this testimony because the man's limp should have made it impossible for him to get up from bed and leave the house quickly enough to see the event. To test this, Juror 8 reenacts the scenario by pretending to be the witness and tries to measure the actual time it would take for someone walking with a limp. To get an accurate result, he asks if anyone among the jurors has a watch with a second hand ("Who's got a watch with a second hand?"). When Juror 2 replies that he has

one ("I have"), Juror 8 asks him to time the reenactment using the watch ("When you want me to start, stamp your foot. That'll be the body falling. Time me from there.").

The directive speech act made by Juror 8 here is in the form of an imperative sentence because the speaker is giving instructions or commands to the listener to perform a specific action. In this case, Juror 8 is asking Juror 2 to follow his directions in order to reveal inconsistencies in the limping man's testimony.

Data 12

Juror 3 : I don't care whether I'm alone or not. It's my right!
Juror 8 : It's your right.
Juror 3 : Wait what d'ya want! I say he's guilty. I gave you my arguments.
Juror 8 : **We're not convinced. We want to hear them again. We have as much time as It takes (*imperative*)**

(Twelve Angry Men, 01:29:29-1:29:51)

This dialogue takes place near the end of the meeting, when only Juror 3 insists that the defendant is guilty, while the other jurors side with Juror 8 and believe otherwise. Cornered and lacking strong arguments to support his opinion, Juror 3 can only say that the defendant is guilty without providing any solid evidence ("I say he's guilty. I gave you my arguments."). Representing the other jurors, Juror 8 expresses dissatisfaction with this baseless claim and asks Juror 3 to present his arguments again ("We're not convinced... We want to hear them again.").

Juror 8's directive speech act in this dialogue is in the form of an imperative because he is commanding the other speaker to do something. In this case, Juror 8 is telling Juror 3 to properly present his arguments if he still firmly holds his position.

CONCLUSION

After conducting a study on the directive speech acts used by Juror 8, the main character in the film *Twelve Angry Men* (1957), it was found that he employs all three types of directive speech acts throughout his conversations with the other jurors. These directive speech acts serve various purposes, including asking questions, making suggestions, requesting, commanding, forbidding, and reminding. Among these, the interrogative form is the most frequently used. This is because Juror 8 consistently questions aspects such as eyewitness testimony and evidence that he finds suspicious, even though he initially stands as a minority among the jurors. This study offers new insights into the application of directive speech acts in film characters. For future research, it is recommended to explore other types of speech acts beyond directives, such as assertive, commissive, declarative, and expressive acts. Additionally, it is suggested to conduct studies using other media forms, such as television series or print media.

REFERENCES

- Aritonang, R. O., & Ambalegin, A. (2023). FORMS OF DIRECTIVE ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS IN STEVE TV SHOW A Pragmatic Analysis. *Jurnal E-Science Humanity*.
- Canadia, P. C., & Bustam, M. R. (2021). ANALISIS INTERPERSONAL MEANING PADA TUTURAN TOKOH MARCUS DALAM SHORT FILM "LOOP". *MAHADAYA Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 1(2), 173-180. <https://doi.org/10.34010/mhd.v1i2.5390>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: choosing among five approaches*. In Thousand Oaks (Ed.), Sage Publications, Inc. (Vol. 2). Sage.
- Frandika, E., & Idawati. (2020). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi dalam Film Pendek "Tilik (2018)." *Pena Literasi : Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 3(14), 61–69. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/penaliterasi>
- EmailGhassani, A., & Nugroho, C. (2018). Pemaknaan Rasisme Dalam Film (Analisis Resepsi Film Get Out). *Jurnal Manajemen Maranatha*, 18(2), 127-134.
- Ghassani, A., & Nugroho, C. (2019). PEMAKNAAN RASISME DALAM FILM (ANALISIS RESEPSI FILM GET OUT). *Jurnal Manajemen Maranatha*, 18(2), 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.28932/jmm.v18i2.1619>
- Juanda. (2021). Illocutionary Speech Act in Comic during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Proceeding of International Conference on Business, Economics, Social Sciences, and Humanities*, 2, 468–473. <https://doi.org/10.34010/icobest.v2i.307>
- Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing english semantics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Permata, H. N., & Arianingsih, A. (2022). TINDAK TUTUR ILOKUSI TIDAK LANGSUNG DALAM ANIME BUNGOU STRAY DOGS. *MAHADAYA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Budaya*, 2(1), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.34010/mhd.v2i1.703>
- Prayitno, H., J. (2017). *Studi Sosiopragmatik*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University Press.
- Searle, J., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sutedi, D. (2008). *Dasar-dasar Linguistik Bahasa Jepang* (Edisi Ketiga). Humaniora.
- Wisnu Adi Putra, I. P., & Sedeng, I. N. (2022). Directive Illocutionary Acts Found in the Movies 21 And 22 Jump Street. *Humanis*, 26(2), 180. <https://doi.org/10.24843/jh.2022.v26.i02.p03>