PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF ILLOCUTIONARY ACT USED IN QUARRELLING SCENE OF "TED 2" MOVIE

Faza Ghalib Miko Bramantio*, Hero Gunawan
Widyatama University, Indonesia
faza.miko@widyatama.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research examines the use of illocutionary speech acts in the quarrelling scenes of the film "Ted 2," employing a pragmatic approach to analyze how characters communicate emotions and intentions during conflicts. Understanding speech acts in cinematic dialogue is crucial for comprehending character dynamics and narrative development. The research aims to identify the types and functions of illocutionary acts present in the film's argumentative exchanges. Using a qualitative descriptive methodology, the study analyzes transcripts of selected quarrelling scenes, focusing on verbal interactions and contextual cues. Data analysis follows Searle's classification of illocutionary acts: assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. Findings reveal a predominance of assertive and expressive speech acts in the analyzed scenes, reflecting characters' tendencies to state facts and express emotions during conflicts. Directive acts are also significant, indicating attempts to influence others' behavior. The study concludes that the distribution and functions of illocutionary acts in "Ted 2" contribute to the portrayal of character relationships and conflict escalation. This analysis enhances our understanding of how language functions in conveying relational conflicts within cinematic narratives, offering insights into the pragmatic aspects of film dialogue.

Keywords: *Pragmatic Study, Speech Acts, Communication Strategies, Types Illocutionary act, Quarrelling Scene.*

INTRODUCTION

Film, a visual art form using moving images and sound, has evolved since the late 19th century. It includes documentaries, fiction films, and educational resources and refers to the physical medium itself. Used in education since the 1930s, film serves as a cultural learning tool showing interactions between people from diverse backgrounds while following linguistic and social norms. The history of film includes the first commercial screenings in the late 1890s, leading to technical innovations and changes in distribution.

However, in the film itself, language is a means of communication between individuals, conveying ideas, emotions, and desires through symbols. Verderber defines language as the words and their use in communication within a community, region, or cultural tradition. Richards and Platt describe language as the organized system of human communication through sounds or symbols. It can be spoken by the majority or a minority within a nation, like Tamil in India. Language encompasses a wide range of uses and is essential for connecting people and conveying thoughts and feelings.

Regardless to language, linguistics is directly related to it. Linguistics is the scientific study of language, analyzing its properties and characteristics across various fields. It is a multidisciplinary subject that combines tools from different sciences and humanities to understand human language thoroughly. It has theoretical and practical applications focused on improving language education and literacy.

Furthermore, in pragmatics, language function is examined through speech acts, which involve both explicit and implicit meanings. (Yule, 1996:3) notes that illocution is the most widely discussed component in pragmatics, as it reveals the speaker's purpose in a speech act. Rahayu, Syahrizal, and Sadikin (2019) define speech acts as language actions during speaking. According to Swastiana et al. (2020), speech acts consist of locution (what is said), illocution (intention), and perlocution (effect). To study illocutionary speech act, this research investigates the type of illocutionary speech act and their functions found in "Ted 2" movie by addressing the following research question formulated as below:

1. What are the types of illocutionary acts found in Ted 2 Movie?
2. What are the functions of illocutionary act found in Ted 2 Movie?

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Pragmatics

Pragmatics involves the examination of the significance conveyed by a speaker's utterances. According to Laia Y, & Hati M (2021), Pragmatics is the study of utterance meaning. Furthermore, it provides determination of the meaning under specified language for better understanding and interpreting language in communication. Pragmatics also examines how communication is influenced by various factors like social norms and cultural beliefs. Ultimately, pragmatics seeks to uncover the true intentions behind verbal communication. Yule's (1996) work identifies four areas as central to the field of pragmatics:

1. The study of pragmatics examines what speakers mean. It indicates that the messages communicated by the speaker extend beyond the literal words spoken. It is now related to the form of the utterances, but rather to the intended meaning that the speaker conveys through their words. The listener must uncover this deeper meaning to facilitate effective communication.

2. The study of contextual meaning is known as pragmatics. Depending on their audience, the setting, the time, and the situation, speakers must consider what they

want to say. This is important because the context affects how the listener interprets the message. To improve communication, the listener must possess shared knowledge with the speaker.

3. The study of pragmatics focuses on communicating more than is stated. In this situation, listeners must explore the underlying meanings that speakers aim to express. To enhance communication, the listener needs to be able recognize and comprehend these hidden meanings.

4. Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. Communication styles should vary depending on the audience; for instance, interactions with peers differ significantly from those with parents. The use of slang is generally acceptable among friends, whereas it may be inappropriate in conversations with parents. This distinction arises from the relative social distance that necessitates the use of more formal language when addressing elders or parental figures consequently, it is essential to be attentive to the choice of vocabulary and language register employed in different context and with various interlocutors.

Pragmatics requires us to recognize that the meaning of an utterance extends beyond the dictionary definitions of the words themselves. It's about understanding the implied meaning and the speaker's intention. As Richard and Schmidt (2002) define it, pragmatics is the study of how language is used in communication, taking into account the sentence, the surrounding context, and the specific situation. Several core components define the field of pragmatics, including implicature, discourse acts, presupposition, setting, contiguousness sets, deixis, and reference. These elements help us analyze and interpret the full meaning of communication.

Speech Acts

Speech act theory, initially proposed by J.L. Austin (1962) and developed further by J. Searle (1976), examines how language functions as a tool for performing actions. It links language meaning to "speech acts," which are actions accomplished through utterances. These acts are commonly divided into five categories: declarations, representatives/assertive, expressive, directives, and commissive. Speech act theory has found application in diverse fields like applied linguistics, literature, and film analysis.

Within the broader field of pragmatics, speech acts are closely related to "discourse acts," which are crucial to understanding how speakers and listeners use language in

communication. According to Yule (1996) and Bach (1979), discourse acts demonstrate that verbal communication carries an inherent message and involves active participation, moving beyond simple dialect. Austin (in Tsui, 1994), Yule (1996), and Birner (2013) all emphasize that discourse acts are actions carried out through spoken statements; articulating something inherently involves doing something. The speaker, therefore, can convey physical activity through these discourse acts, utilizing not only words but also nonverbal cues like facial expressions. These conveyed messages are integral to performing actions, which can then be further understood by analyzing them through the lens of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts.

Locutionary

The locutionary act is the most basic level. It refers to the act of producing a meaningful utterance (Austin, 1962). This involves forming words into a grammatically correct sentence and conveying a specific sense and reference. In simpler terms, it's the act of saying something that makes sense. As Cutting (2002) points out, it's about what is actually uttered. Yule (1996) further emphasizes that a locutionary act is the production of a meaningful expression. An example of a locutionary act is saying *"It's raining outside."* This is a straightforward statement conveying information about the current weather conditions. The locutionary act focuses on the literal meaning of the words used.

Illocutionary

Illocutionary act goes beyond the literal meaning and focuses on the speaker's intention. It's the act performed by making the utterance (Yule, 1996). This is where the communicative force of the statement comes into play. It encompasses actions like making a promise, issuing a warning, asking a question, or offering an apology. The illocutionary act represents the speaker's purpose in saying something. It's also considered the most important aspect of a speech act because it conveys the force the speaker intends to have (Yule, 1996). For instance, saying "*I apologize for that*" is not merely a statement of fact; it's the act of apologizing itself. The speaker is actively seeking to express remorse and potentially repair a relationship.

Perlocutionary

Perlocutionary act considers the effect of the utterance on the listener (Hufford & Heasley, 1983). It's the consequence or result of the speech act. This includes the listener's thoughts, feelings, or actions that are brought about by the speaker's words. A perlocutionary

act is not solely determined by the utterance itself but is highly dependent on the context and the individuals involved. It encompasses all the effects, whether intended or unintended, that a particular statement has in a specific situation. For example, saying "*It's cold in here*" is a locutionary act, but the perlocutionary act might be that the listener closes the window, turns up the heat, or offers the speaker a sweater. The speaker's statement influences the listener's behavior, leading them to act in response to it. The key characteristic of perlocutionary acts is that they are distinctive to the circumstances of the utterance.

Illocutionary Classification

Illocutionary classification refers to the categorization of speech acts based on their intended meaning and function within communication. According to Searle (2020), illocutionary acts fall into five categories Directive, expressive, commissive, assertive, declarations. And divided as below.

Directives

Speech acts known as directives are used by speakers to persuade listeners to take action. They convey the speaker's desire (Yule, 1996:54). These are attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something, this speech acts include asking, requesting, pleading, inviting, and suggesting. For example:

"Could you please stay here? I don't want to be alone".

The sentence above can be categorized as a requesting within directive speech act category, indicating that the speaker is asking the hearer to remain in that location. This interpretation is supported by the word "*Could you please stay here?*".

Commissive

Speech acts that commit the speaker to a future course of action are known as commissive acts (Yule, 1996:54). These involve commitments by the speaker to perform a certain action in the future, promises, threats, offers, rejections, and pledges are a few examples. For instance:

"He's going to that mountain; stay here I'll be right back".

The sentence above can be categorized as a promising within commissive speech act category, indicating that the speaker promising the hearer that will be back soon. Whis interpretation is supported by the word "*I'll be right back*" which signifies the speaker's intention to take action in the future.

Expressive

Speech acts that convey a psychological state are known as expressive. These convey the speaker's emotional state or attitude towards a situation, they include expression of thanking, apologizing, greeting, congratulating, and anger are examples of these speech acts (Yule, 1996:53). For instance:

"I'm so sorry for your lost".

The sentence above can be categorized as an apologizing within expressive speech act category, indicating that the speaker is conveying sympathy and compassion towards the hearer's situation. This interpretation is supported by the phrase *"I'm so sorry,"* which reflects the speaker's emotional response to the hearer's grief.

Assertive / Representatives

One of kind of illocutionary speech act that express the speaker's beliefs or opinions is an assertive speech act (Yule, 1996: 53). These are statements that commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. Example include assert, stating, information, reporting, demonstration, grievance, and describing are the acts. For instance:

"I know her, she is an honest person."

The sentence above can be categorized as a stating within assertive speech act category, regardless of the veracity of the scenario, the speaker stating that the individual is trustworthy and honest. This interpretation is supported by the phrase "*she is an honest person"* which presents information can be verified as true.

Declaration

A declaration or declarative action is one that, just by being said, changed the state (Yule, 1996:53). These are statement that bring about a change in the future simply by being uttered. Example include declaring, approving, disapproving, verifying, and nominating is the instance of declaration acts. For instance, in a sentence is:

"I now pronounce you husband and wife"

The sentence above can be categorized as a declaring within declaration speech act category, indicating that the speaker is enacting a change in status through their utterance. This interpretation is supported by the phrase "I *now pronounce"* which signifies that the speaker has the authority to create a new social reality through their words.

METHODOLOGY

This research employed a qualitative descriptive approach to investigate the types and functions of illocutionary speech acts within the quarrelling scenes of the film Ted 2. The goal was to provide a detailed and comprehensive understanding of how characters utilize language to convey emotions, intentions, and navigate conflict within the film's narrative. The primary data source for this study was the film *"Ted 2"* (Seth MacFarlane, 2015). Specifically, the quarrelling scenes were the focus of analysis. The selection of these scenes was based on their high concentration of interactive dialogue and observable instances of conflict between characters. Data collection involved a process of focused observation and transcription. The researcher watched the selected scenes multiple times, paying close attention to the verbal interactions between characters. A detailed transcript of the dialogue was created, noting not only the words spoken but also contextual cues such as tone of voice, pauses, and observable non-verbal behaviors. This ensured that the analysis captured the full context of each utterance. The data analysis process followed a thematic analysis approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The transcribed dialogues were carefully examined to identify instances of illocutionary speech acts. Each utterance was then categorized according to Searle's (1976) classification of illocutionary acts: assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The analysis of illocutionary acts in the quarrelling scene of Ted 2 revealed distinct patterns in the use of speech acts, categorized according to Searle's classification: assertive, expressive, directive, commissive, and declarative. The findings are summarized as follows:

Table 1. Type of Illocutionary Acts

No	Type of illocutionary act	Frequency	Percentages
1	Assertive	63	39.87%
2	Directive	47	29.75%
3	Expressive	30	18.92%
4	Commissive	13	8.23%
5	Declarative	5	3.23%
	Total	158	100%

Based on the table above, this research has identified and analyzed the types of illocutionary acts present in the quarrelling scenes of the movie "Ted 2." The analysis includes the frequency of each illocutionary act type found in the selected dialogues and scenes, as well as their respective percentages relative to the total occurrences. This detailed examination reveals how different illocutionary acts such as assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative function within the movie's conflict-driven interactions. The distribution and frequency data provide insight into the characters' communicative intentions and emotional expressions, highlighting the predominance of certain speech acts that contribute to the narrative's portrayal of quarrels and relational dynamics. Overall, this analysis underscores the pragmatic role of illocutionary acts in shaping the film's dialogue and advancing its storytelling.

Discussion

This research has analyzed the illocutionary speech acts present in the quarrelling scene in the movie *"Ted 2"* by examining the movie, dialogue, and intentions of their utterances, providing the analysis with a context of the movie, picture example of the quarrelling scene, also analysis of the dialogue. This study aims to giving a deeper understanding of how language functions in conveying relational conflict within a cinematic context.

Assertive

The background of the Ted 2 couple's argument act scene after Ted scolded Tamy Lynn for spending money on shopping, Tamy Lynn believed she had a legitimate cause to spend her money and retaliated by criticizing Ted's cannabis investment practices and his shortcomings as a husband. As an argument came to an end, Ted and Tamy began throwing things at each other.

exactly and I'm not I'm not going out and buying designer [_] I'm

Ted : "I'm starving, what the hell are you doing over there?"

Tamy: "I'm curing cancer. **I'm cooking your fucking steak**; what do you think I'm doing?"

Ted : "What do I think you do? **You're bleeding us dry is what I think you're doing**."

In the movie's, the transcript demonstrates that the couple's quarrelling contains three expressive speech acts, seventeen assertive speech acts, and nine directive speech acts. Within the dialogue above, there's several assertive speech acts are present, each contributing to the overall dynamic between Ted and Tamy. Ted initiates with *"I'm starving,"* a statement conveying his physical state and placing a subtle pressure on Tamy. Tamy responds with two assertive acts: *"I'm curing cancer,"* used sarcastically to deflect Ted's impatience, and "I'm cooking your fucking steak," a direct and factual statement of her current activity. Ted then counters with *"You're bleeding us dry is what I think you're doing,"* a forceful assertive act expressing his belief about Tamy's financial behavior.

The functions of these assertive acts vary which Ted's initial statement serves to express his need and indirectly prompt action, Tamy's statements function to both deflect criticism and provide information, while Ted's final assertive act serves as a direct accusation, highlighting the underlying tension and conflict in their relationship. Each assertive statement contributes to the building conflict and reveals aspects of their individual perspectives and concerns.

Directive

The background of the Ted 2 neighbors' quarrel act sequences the movie is as follows: He yelled at Ted from his appartement since his neighbors were annoyed by their loud argument. Ted refuses to back down and engage in a dispute with his neighbor that annoys their other Russian neighbor. When they decided to collectively criticize their neighbors because they both disliked one of them, the argument came to an end.

Neighbor 1: "**Shut the Fuck up!**"

Ted   : "For Christ's sake!"

Ted   : "**Hey, you shut the fuck up!**"

As the analysis of neighbors' quarrel scene there are three expressive speech acts, four assertive speech acts, seven directive speech acts, and one commissive speech acts, are all present in the neighbor's argument. the dialogue above exemplifies a potent combination of directive and expressive speech acts that prominently displayed, showcasing an escalating conflict. Neighbor 1 initiates with a forceful *"Shut the Fuck up!"*, a direct command intended to immediately silence the other party. Ted response with *"For Christ's sake!"*, which, while seemingly an expressive utterance of frustration, also function as an indirect directive, implying that the neighbor should reconsider their actions and cease the disturbance. Ted then escalates the situation with a more direct *"Hey, you shut the fuck up!"*, mirroring the initial command and reinforcing the intention to silence the neighbor.

Functioning as a directive, the statement is a direct command intended to halt the listener's speech and enforce silence. Simultaneously, the phrase is deeply expressive, conveying a strong sense of anger, annoyance, or frustration through its forceful and profane language. The inclusion of *"Fuck"* amplifies the emotional charge, clearly communicating the speaker's negative psychological state. Thus, the dialogue aims not only to control the listener's behavior but also to express the speaker's intense negative feelings, showcasing a dual-purpose communication strategy.

Expressive

The following described the context of the Ted 2 Movie's first friends' quarrel scene: after discovering numerous pornographic files on Johnny's laptop, Ted concluded that his friend was addicted and needed to move on from his divorce from his wife in order to better himself. Johnny was reluctant to acknowledge it at first, but he eventually came to the realization that he had strayed too far.

look at your [__] ass what to try
[__] get your ass up

hell you doing looking at my private
[__] what are you talking about

Ted   : "I can never get a signal in your apartment. Hey, can I use your laptop?"

Johnny : "Yeah, go ahead."

Ted   : "**Okay, thanks**."

Ted   : "**What the fuck?**"

Johnny : "**Holy shit! Dude**, what's the matter? What happened? What's going on?"

(Ted 2, Friends' Quarrel Scene 1, 19:07 – 20:47)

There are seven expressive speech acts, thirteen assertive speech acts, thirteen directive speech acts, five commissive speech acts, and two declarative speech acts in the friend's argument, according to the illocutionary acts on the movie transcript analysis. Based on dialogue above, the expressive speech acts reveal a range of emotions and reactions to unfolding events. Ted initiates the expressive acts with *"Okay, thanks,"* conveying his gratitude for Johnny's willingness to lend him the laptop. Later, Ted exclaims *"What the fuck?"* expressing surprise, confusion, or perhaps frustration at something he encounters while using the laptop. Johnny responds to Ted's exclamation with *"Holy shit!"* expressing surprise and concern, and follows up with *"Dude, what's the matter? What happened? What's going on?"* These questions, while technically directive in seeking information, also function expressively, conveying Johnny's concern and desire to understand the cause of Ted's distress.

The functions of these expressive acts are to communicate emotional states, build rapport (through expressions of gratitude), and signal shifts in the situation (through expressions of surprise and concern), driving the interaction forward.

Declarative

Although the following describes the context of the second scene in Ted 2 friends' quarrels where Ted was disappointed, and Sam felt bad that she didn't win Ted's case. However, Johnny stood up for Sam, claiming that she had done her best. That infuriated Ted, who blamed their recently developed romantic bond on Johnny and Sam not enough commitment to helping him.

Ted   : "**So that's it. I'm property**."

Johnny : "Ted, dude, I'm so sorry, man. This completely sucks."

Ted   : "No rights, no nothing."

Johnny : "Ted, dude, I'm so sorry, man. This completely sucks."

Sam   : "I feel terrible. let you guys down all over again."

<div align="right">(Ted 2, Friends' Quarrel Scene 2, 1:30:48 – 1:32:10)</div>

Based transcript analyzing contains the following illocutionary acts four expressive speech acts, thirteen assertive speech act, seven directive speech acts, and one declarative speech acts from second friends' quarrel. On dialogue above it shows an example of declarative speech acts that from at first phrases Ted is stating what he believes to be a fact about his current situation. He conveying his understanding of his status as the statement *"I'm property"* is a declarative speech acts that Ted utterance itself brings about the state of being property which has been declared by the courts in the movie.

The function of the declarative speech act *"I'm property"* in the provided *"Ted 2"* dialogue is to emphasize Ted's understanding and acceptance of his changed legal status, highlighting the impact of the court's decision on his identity and freedom.

Commissive

The following describe context of the Ted 2 movie's enemy quarrel is disguised as a Ninja Turtle comic character, Donny, who is fascinated with possessing a talking Teddy

Bear, begged Ted to go backstage and pretended an autograph request. Donny had tried to kidnap Ted and even hurt him before, so when he opened his mask after they were alone, a fight broke out. Ended with Ted has been kidnaped and interrogated by 2 his enemies who Donny duck tape Ted to the operating table so he could dissect him. When Donny expressed his desire to learn Ted's secret for creating another Teddy bear that resembled Ted. When Donny was about to dissect Ted, Johnny arrived. Then the argument turned into a fight.

Ted   : "Holy shit! Donny!"

Donny : "It's good to see you, Ted. It's been some time, hasn't it?"

Ted   : "What? You mean since you ripped me in half?"

Donny : "That wasn't supposed to happen, that was an accident. **I have some big plans**

           for you Ted, very big plans. I need you to come with me now"

Ted   : "Go to hell!"

           : "*(Ted has been kidnaped)*"

Donny   : "This isn't about you, Ted. You're only one bear. **We're gonna figure out what**

           makes you real, and then we're gonna make millions of Teds... One for every child in the world. One for me. One that loves me just as much as you love John."

<p align="right">(Ted 2, Enemy's Quarrel Scene, 1:35:44 – 1: 45:14)</p>

The illocutionary acts in the above transcript demonstrate that there were thirteen expressive, sixteen assertive, eleven directive, seven commissive, and two declarative speech acts during the enemy's argument. Based on dialogue above, in the phrase *"I have*

some big plans for you Ted, very big plans" it shown as a commissive speech acts that Donny utterance is committed to do something as a big plan for Ted that Donny hasn't seen Ted for a long time, and followed with phrase *"We're gonna figure out what makes you real, and then we're gonna make millions of Teds"* as Donny state to commit to dissect Ted and find out the secret of Ted that feels so alive and Donny's promises to make more of teddy bear.

The function of Donny's commissive speech acts in this *"Ted 2"* dialogue is to reveal his intentions and plans for Ted, highlighting his commitment to a future course of action that involves experimenting on Ted and creating copies, functioning as both a twisted promise and a direct threat.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the illocutionary acts in the quarrelling scenes of the movie Ted 2, focusing on their types and functions as classified by Searle's speech act theory. The type of classification of illocutionary acts used in this movie are assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, declarative which is Assertive acts were the most frequently used, reflecting characters' tendencies to state facts, express beliefs, or assert opinions during conflicts. Expressive acts were also prominent, showcasing emotional states such as anger, frustration, or sarcasm. These acts highlighted the emotional intensity of the quarrels. Directive acts were significant in influencing other characters' actions or decisions, emphasizing power struggles and attempts to control conversations. Commissive acts, such as threats or promises, added dramatic tension by committing characters to future actions. Declarative acts, though less frequent, served as pivotal moments for altering social dynamics or resolving disputes. The functions of these illocutionary acts were closely tied to the narrative and character interactions in Ted 2. Specifically assertive and expressive acts were essential for portraying relational conflicts and revealing characters' emotions and perspectives. Directive acts played a critical role in escalating disputes by attempting to influence others' behavior. Commissive acts heightened conflict dynamics through promises or threats that carried significant narrative weight. Declarative acts, while rare, were impactful in redefining relationships or establishing authority during quarrels.

REFERENCES

A. H. W. P, M. R. Nababan, & S, Marmanto. (2019). Speech Acts Found in The Movie:

The Good Doctor. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding,* 6(5), 840-848

Adinda, I., & Nurdin, N. (2024). An Analysis Of Illocutionary Acts On Anies Baswedan's Last Speech From Governorship Of DKI Jakarta. *Jurnal Nakula: Pusat Ilmu Pendidikan, Bahasa dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(2), 209-219.

Annisa, H., & Suparto, S. (2022). Directive Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Act in Now You See Me 1 Movie. *JEdu: Journal of English Education*, 2(3), 223-231.

Budiantini, N. K. N., & Pratiwi, D. P. E. (2024). An Analysis of Illocutionary Act and Context of Situation Found in The Movie "Angela's Christmas". *Journal of Linguistic and Literature Studies*, 2(1), 18-28.

Dianita, D., & Sofyan, R. A. (2023). Felicity Conditions in Speech Act from the "Knives Out" Movie: A Pragmatic Study. *English Journal Literacy Utama*, 8(1), 775-785.

Dewi, E. S., & Jannah, R. (2022). Illocutionary Acts Analysis of the Main Character in "Brave" Movie. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy)*, 6(1), 42-54.

Fitriani, F., Mahmud, M., & Nasir, C. (2020). An analysis of illocutionary acts in Fantastic Beasts: The Crimes of Grindelwald movie. *Research in English and Education Journal*, 5(3), 85-99.

Hendar, H., & Via, L. (2024). Pragmatic Analysis on Illocutionary Acts in Black Adam Movie. *JALL* (*Journal of Applied Linguistic and Literacy),* 8(2), 184-197

Hidayat, A., Radeb, L, & Lampung, I. (2016). Speech Acts: Force Behind Words (Vol. 9, Issue 1).

Leech, G. (1996). Principles of Pragmatics. *New York: Longman.*

P. Grundy. (2000). Doing Pragmatics. *New York: Oxford University Press.*

Rahayani, F. H., & Dwiyuliana, R. (2018). An Analysis of Speech Acts Performed in The United States of Barrack Obama's Speech Election 2009.

Rustandi, A., Febriani, R. B., & Sugiarto, B. R. (2025). Pragmatic and Grammatical competence interface in second language acquisition: conceptual framework and construction. JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy), 9(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.25157/jall.v9i1.17802

Searle, J. R., & Ander Veken, D. V. (1985). Foundations of Illocutionary Logic. *Philosophy in Review,* 6(7), 354-356.

S. Simon. (2014). Speech Acts in Written Advertisements: Identification, Classification and Analysis. *Procedia-Social Behav. Sci. Elsevier*, 234-239.

Swarniti, N. W. (2023). A Pragmatic Analysis of Illocutionary Act Used in Valley of The Lanterns Movie. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling (JPDK)*, *5*(1), 883-891.

Sugiantini, N. M. P., Maharani, P. D., & Winartha, I. G. N. (2021). An analysis of directive illocutionary acts in the complex: lockdown 2020 movie. *Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 128-138.

Widdowson, P., George, Y. (1996). Oxford Introductions to Language Study: Pragmatics by George Yule. *Oxford University Press.*

Yuda, J., Nababan, M., & Djatmika, D. (2019). Quarrelling: Speech Acts Found in Quarrelling Speech Event. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding,* Equivalence in Subtitle. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-4 2019.2286859