COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS USED BY ED WARREN IN THE CONJURING MOVIE

Hanzl Gustav Gloor 1*, **Ratini Setyowati** 2, **Aris Hidayatulloh** 3
English Study Program, Faculty of Law and Business, Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia
[1]220415008@mhs.udb.ac.id, [2]ratini_setyo@udb.ac.id, [3]aris_hidayatulloh@udb.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The horror film The Conjuring (2013) presents a unique pragmatic phenomenon through its portrayal of a high-stakes supernatural crisis where authority, technical coordination, and language are vital for survival. Unlike typical horror figures who express panic, the lead protagonist, Ed Warren, functions as a licensed demonologist whose unique expertise demands authoritative, structured, and strategic communication under extreme psychological pressure. This study aims to examine the communicative functions of directive speech acts produced exclusively by Ed Warren, grounded in John Searle (1979) speech act theory and Spradley qualitative ethnographic method. Out of 101 analysed directive utterances, the results reveal five distinct pragmatic functions: requesting (35.6%) functions for operational coordination and investigation setup; commanding (30.7%) functions for high-authority emergency enforcement during exorcism rituals; advising (17.8%) functions for strategic spiritual counselling and safety protocols; warning (10.9%) functions for immediate physical and existential threat management; and prohibition (5.0%) functions for establishing protective environmental boundaries. The study concludes that directive speech acts in cinematic dialogue serve not simply as instrumental commands, but as dynamic leadership strategies calibrated by Ed Warren's institutional authority, professional role, and the situational urgency of supernatural crises.

Keywords: *Communicative Functions, Directive Speech Acts, The Conjuring, Pragmatics*

INTRODUCTION

Human language operates as an active social instrument used by speakers to achieve pragmatic goals, establish social positions, and influence hearer behavior. Within pragmatic inquiry, Speech Act Theory pioneered by Austin (1962) and further refined by Searle (1969, 1979) provides a framework for analyzing how speaker meaning is constructed and executed in specific communicative contexts. Searle (1979) categorizes illocutionary acts into five major classes: Assertive, Directives, Commissive, Expressive, and Declaratives. Among these, directive speech acts hold a crucial role in goal-oriented human interactions, as they express the speaker's attempt to get the hearer to perform a future action. Directives span a wide spectrum of illocutionary force, ranging from polite requests and advisory suggestions to authoritative commands, urgent warnings, and strict prohibitions. While Searle's taxonomy identifies the type of illocutionary force expressed in an utterance, Kreidler (1998) further explains that directive utterances are fundamentally used to influence the behavior or responses of the hearer, and that their communicative function is determined not by literal form alone, but by what the speaker intends to accomplish within a given context. This functional perspective is central to the present study, which examines not merely how Ed Warren's directives are structured, but what they are strategically used to achieve.

In cinematic storytelling, dialogue functions as a primary medium for constructing character identity, driving narrative tension, and reflecting real-world communicative dynamics. While general film dialogue often mimics everyday conversational norms, horror cinema introduces

extreme psychological stress, existential panic, and life-threatening crises. Under such high-pressure conditions, communication choices must adapt rapidly to balance clarity, professional authority, and immediate survival protocols.

James Wan's *The Conjuring* (2013) presents a distinct pragmatic environment. Unlike typical horror characters who react to supernatural threats with unstructured panic, the lead protagonist, Ed Warren, operates as a Vatican-recognized demonologist and investigator. His professional expertise requires him to maintain a structured, authoritative, and strategic mode of communication during severe demonic manifestations. Ed Warren must simultaneously manage technical equipment, delegate tasks to assistants, counsel traumatized victims, and execute solemn religious rituals under severe temporal and physical pressure.

While numerous scholars have investigated directive speech acts in cinematic discourse, existing studies predominantly examine general character interactions across mundane or broad narrative settings. Few studies have dedicated detailed pragmatic investigation to a single specialized leading protagonist navigating crisis management in supernatural contexts. Furthermore, analyzing Ed Warren's verbal strategies aligns with broader media and narrative storytelling discourse, demonstrating how authority and leadership are linguistically constructed to restore stability in high-stakes environments.

Therefore, this study focuses exclusively on the directive speech acts produced by Ed Warren in *The Conjuring*. Grounded in Searle's (1979) speech act framework and Spradley's (1980) qualitative ethnographic method, this article examines how Ed Warren's directives are functionally applied across different narrative stages to establish leadership, direct technical operations, provide spiritual counsel, and manage immediate threats

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a descriptive qualitative research design (Creswell, 2014) focusing on textual, pragmatic, and contextual analysis. The primary data source consists of spoken utterances produced exclusively by the character Ed Warren in the 2013 horror film *The Conjuring*, transcribed from verified audio dialogue and English subtitles. Data collection was conducted through a four-step qualitative procedure:

1. Repeated viewing of *The Conjuring* (2013) to observe communicative situations, environmental context, and narrative progression.
2. Verbatim transcription of Ed Warren's spoken lines across the entire film.
3. Identification and extraction of directive speech acts produced by Ed Warren based on Searle's (1979) criteria.
4. Systematic entry of valid directive utterances into a structured matrix alongside contextual notes (hearer, setting, narrative phase, and immediate situational trigger).

Data analysis integrated four theoretical frameworks:

1. Searle's (1979) Taxonomy of Directives: Classifying Ed Warren's directive utterances into five pragmatic categories (*Requesting, Commanding, Advising, Warning,* and *Prohibition*).
2. Petrie & Boggs' (2021) Narrative Plot Framework: Categorizing data across narrative plot stages (*Exposition, Rising Action, Climax, Falling Action, Resolution*) to track how situational urgency influences linguistic choices.
3. Spradley's (1980) Ethnographic Qualitative Method: Utilizing domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis to uncover the underlying communicative functions of Ed Warren's speech acts within his professional role as a demonologist.
4. Kreidler's (1998) Theory of Directive Function: Interpreting each directive utterance in terms of the communicative purpose it accomplishes for the speaker, rather than its literal form alone, to determine the primary function underlying each of Ed Warren's directive categories.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Distribution of Ed Warren's Directive Speech Acts

Out of the total dataset analysed from the movie, Ed Warren produced 101 valid directive speech act utterances. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of these directives across Searle's five primary categories and their corresponding communicative functions:

Table 1. Frequency and Communicative Functions of Ed Warren's Directive Speech Acts

Directive Category	***Total data***	***Percentage* (%)**	**Primary Communicative Function**
Requesting	36	35.6%	Operational coordination, task delegation, and investigation setup
Commanding	31	30.7%	High-authority emergency enforcement, ritual execution, and immediate physical control
Advising	18	17.8%	Strategic spiritual counseling, practical guidance, and safety protocols
Warning	11	10.9%	Immediate physical and existential threat management
Prohibition	5	5.0%	Establishing protective environmental boundaries and preventing risk exposure
Total	**101**	**100.0%**	**Crisis Management & Authoritative Leadership**

In terms of narrative distribution, Ed Warren's directives are heavily concentrated during moments of mounting supernatural tension, peaking in the Rising Action (47.1%) and Climax (19.1%) phases.

3.2 Pragmatic Analysis of Communicative Functions

In this section, 15 representative data items produced exclusively by Ed Warren are analyzed across Searle's (1979) five categories of directive speech acts. The analysis focuses on explaining the specific communicative functions of each utterance, examining

how linguistic form, contextual urgency, speaker authority, and narrative development interact during crisis scenarios.

1. Requesting (35.6%): Operational Coordination and Investigation Setup

Requesting is the most prevalent directive function in Ed Warren's discourse (36 data; 35.6%). Used predominantly during the *Exposition* and early *Rising Action* stages, Ed utilizes requests to delegate technical tasks, manage investigative equipment, and secure voluntary cooperation from traumatized family members without asserting aggressive dominance.

- **Data 1** ***(00:18:16)****: "Georgiana! Could you take Judy upstairs?"*

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed addresses Georgiana at their residence while handling a sudden distraction involving their daughter, Judy.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed employs an indirect, conventionalized request structure utilizing the modal auxiliary *"Could you"*. The primary communicative function of this utterance is tactful task delegation and protective isolation. By framing the directive politely, Ed maintains household decorum while systematically removing his young daughter from a potentially hazardous or stressful environment. The request functions to secure immediate assistance without causing panic or emotional distress to his child.

- **Data 2 (00:44:07)**: ***"All right Drew, you can hit the lights."***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed addresses Drew, a member of his investigative team, while preparing recording equipment inside the Perron farmhouse ahead of overnight surveillance.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed uses a permissive modal construction (*"you can"*) pre-faced by an operational discourse marker (*"All right"*). The main function of this directive is operational task execution and team coordination. As the lead investigator, Ed uses this utterance to signal the exact transition from ambient room lighting to infrared/night-vision monitoring conditions. Rather than barking a harsh command, Ed's request functions to keep team workflow smooth and professional during equipment deployment.

- **Data 3 (00:48:42):** ***"You picking up anything in here, hon?"***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed addresses his wife and clairvoyant partner, Lorraine, while inspecting an active room inside the haunted farmhouse.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed formulates an informal, conversational inquiry directed at Lorraine's psychic abilities, reinforced by the affectionate endearment *"hon"*. The pragmatic function here is diagnostic information-gathering and perceptual consultation relies on Lorraine's clairvoyance to complement his empirical/technical tools; thus, this request functions to elicit expert spiritual feedback to evaluate environmental risks in real time.

2. Commanding (30.7%): High-Authority Emergency Enforcement

Commanding accounts for 30.7% of Ed Warren's directives. Characterized by direct imperative syntax and high illocutionary force, Ed issues commands predominantly during moments of immediate physical necessity, ritual execution, or high tension where rapid compliance is required, though the same bare imperative form also appears, less frequently, in low-stakes domestic contexts where authority stems from his parental rather than professional role.

- **Data 1 (00:05:01):** ***"Hit the lights!"***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed speaks during an early presentation/investigation setup regarding the Annabelle case.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed delivers a direct, unvarnished imperative verb phrase (*"Hit the lights!"*). The primary communicative function of this speech act is immediate environmental control and authoritative execution. Stripped of modal softeners or politeness markers, the high illocutionary force functions to compel instant physical action from his assistant, ensuring seamless presentation flow and immediate adaptation to darkness for visual evidence viewing.

- **Data 2 (00:18:14):** ***"All right, come on, honey."***

Interlocutor & Context: Ed speaks to his young daughter, Judy, while guiding her through the hallway of their home, moments before handing her to Georgiana and reminding her of the museum room rule.

Pragmatic Function: Unlike the other Commanding data, this utterance is a bare directive verb phrase ("come on") softened by the acknowledgment marker "all right" and the affectionate address term "honey." Its function is not emergency compliance but routine physical guidance, prompting Judy to keep moving alongside him. This shows that Ed's use of unmitigated imperative syntax is not restricted to high-tension professional moments; the same bare directive form also organizes ordinary domestic movement, with authority here expressed through parental rather than institutional role.

- **Data 3 (00:43:29):** ***"Take Maurice here!"***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed instructs his team while presenting recorded footage of a severe possession case (Maurice Theriault).

  Pragmatic Function: Ed issues a strict, direct imperative directive. The communicative function is focused instructional orientation and empirical demonstration. Ed asserts his authoritative role as an educator/demonologist, directing his audience's visual and analytical attention to a critical piece of evidence regarding demonic physical manifestation.

3. Advising (17.8%): Strategic Spiritual Counseling and Safety Protocols

Advising comprises 17.8% of Ed's directives. Ed delivers advisory directives as expert recommendations and strategic guidance to inform non-experts on how to navigate supernatural vulnerabilities and stay safe.

- **Data 1 (00:49:04):** ***"You know, with all that's been going on... why haven't you just moved out?"***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed converses with the Perron family at their kitchen table after learning about the escalating nocturnal attacks.

Pragmatic Function: Ed frames his advice through a rhetorical interrogative (*"why haven't you..."*). The communicative function is strategic relocation counseling and risk assessment. Ed invites the traumatized homeowners to evaluate their extreme vulnerability critically, functioning as a non-confrontational recommendation to evacuate the dangerous environment immediately.

- **Data 2 (00:49:43):** ***"From the first occurrence."***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed elaborates on his previous statement to the Perrons regarding when they should have abandoned the residence.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed utilizes a elliptical prepositional phrase that functions as a supplemental advisory directive. The pragmatic function is expert protocol reinforcement. By emphasizing the ideal timeline for escaping paranormal threats, Ed reinforces the severity of demonic escalations, advising the family on standard safety principles when facing malignant entities.

- **Data 3 (00:52:19):** ***"Well, Lorraine and I both feel that what your house needs is a cleansing."***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed presents his initial diagnostic conclusion to Roger and Carolyn Perron.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed uses a hedged declarative formula (*"Lorraine and I both feel..."*) to deliver professional advice. The communicative function is remedial action proposal and spiritual solution modeling. Ed gently directs the family toward authorizing an official religious intervention, positioning a formal cleansing as the necessary prerequisite for restoring peace to their home.

5. **Warning (10.9%): Immediate Threat Management**

   Warning directives are triggered by immediate physical hazards, logical explanations of danger, or demonic characteristics, functioning to alert hearers to hidden risks.

- **Data 1 (00:17:44):** ***"We have to take great precaution."***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed speaks to a guest/reporter while standing near the entrance of his locked occult museum.

Pragmatic Function: Ed uses an obligation modal (*"have to"*) paired with an explicit risk noun (*"great precaution"*). The primary communicative function is precautionary threat framing and safety enforcement. Ed warns the listener that the room contains highly volatile, demonic artifacts, establishing an immediate psychological boundary regarding the invisible risks present inside.

- **Data 2 (00:35:04): "*But you take the water coming off the pipe combined with the wind coming through the broken window, these boards are gonna expand and rub against each other.*"**

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed logically explains the mundane causes behind eerie noises in the Perron house during an initial walkthrough.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed provides a detailed conditional explanation of physical cause and effect. The pragmatic function is rational debunking and false-alarm prevention. By warning the family about physical house structural expansion, Ed prevents unnecessary hysteria, ensuring that mundane structural defects are distinguished from actual supernatural phenomena.

- **Data 3 (00:47:15): *"Well, rancid smells could indicate some type of demonic activity."***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed analyzes Carolyn Perron's report of foul, rotting odors appearing suddenly across the bedrooms.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed delivers a technical warning framed by a epistemic modal (*"could indicate"*). The communicative function is existential hazard identification and demonic threat profiling. Ed alerts the victims that sensory anomalies like rancid odors are primary indicators of an escalating demonic presence, warning them that they are dealing with a dangerous inhuman entity.

6. **Prohibition (5.0%): Establishing Protective Boundaries**

   Prohibition is characterized by negative imperatives or modal restrictions. Ed uses prohibitions to enforce non-negotiable safety boundaries and restrict dangerous behaviors.

- **Data 1 (00:16:15): *"Just don't touch anything."***

interlocutor & Context: Ed guides a visitor into his occult artifact room.

Pragmatic Function: Ed issues a strict negative imperative (*"don't touch"*) softened slightly by the particle *"Just"*. The primary communicative function is physical containment and risk mitigation. Ed sets a strict boundary to prevent unauthorized physical contact with cursed objects, protecting the hearer from activating latent demonic attachments.

- **Data 2 (00:18:18):** ***"You can't go into this room, no matter what, remember?"***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed speaks firmly to his young daughter, Judy, near the locked museum door.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed uses a negative modal of ability/permission (*"you can't"*) reinforced by an absolute conditional clause (*"no matter what"*). The pragmatic function is absolute boundary enforcement and child protection. Ed establishes an unyielding rule to guarantee his daughter's physical and spiritual safety, prohibiting access to a high-risk zone under any circumstances.

- **Data 3 (01:13:10):** ***"No, wait! We need this."***

  Interlocutor & Context: Ed intervenes when someone attempts to disconnect or move essential monitoring equipment during an active event.

  Pragmatic Function: Ed combines an urgent negative marker (*"No"*), a temporal hold command (*"wait!"*), and a causal justification (*"We need this"*). The communicative function is procedural disruption prevention and operational protection. Ed prohibits the hearer from interrupting the technical investigation setup, ensuring that essential evidence collection tools remain active during a critical phase.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal that Ed Warren's directive speech acts in *The Conjuring* (2013) are not merely routine conversational turns, but strategically calibrated instruments of authority, technical delegation, and crisis management. Grounded in Searle's (1979) speech act framework, Kreidler's (1998) theory of directive function, and contextualized through plot structure, the pragmatic choices made by Ed Warren

demonstrate a direct relationship between situational urgency, professional role, and illocutionary force.

Taken together, Requesting and Commanding account for 66.3% of Ed's directives, indicating that his communicative priority is overwhelmingly operational rather than affective. This dominance reflects Trosborg's (1995) observation that professionals coordinating a shared task tend to favor mitigated request forms for routine cooperation while reserving bare imperatives for moments demanding instant compliance. Ed's requests (e.g., *"Could you take Judy upstairs?"*) preserve the hearer's face and social ease during calm investigative phases, whereas his commands (e.g., *"Hit the lights!"*) strip away modal softeners entirely once ritual execution or physical danger removes room for negotiation. This pattern supports Ervin-Tripp's (1976) claim that directive form is compressed under time pressure: the same speaker shifts illocutionary strategy not because his institutional authority changes, but because the felicity conditions of the situation, namely the hearer's capacity to deliberate, change.

Advising (17.8%) functions differently from the two categories above in that it consistently preserves the hearer's decisional autonomy even though Ed speaks from clear professional authority. Utterances such as *"why haven't you just moved out?"* and *"what your house needs is a cleansing"* are framed as recommendations rather than orders, consistent with Perkins's (1983) and Allan's (1986) account of the performative verb advise as oriented toward the hearer's own benefit rather than the speaker's demand for compliance. This restraint is pragmatically significant: as a Vatican-recognized demonologist, Ed could plausibly assert unmitigated authority over frightened, non-expert clients, yet he consistently chooses hedged, collaborative phrasing. This suggests that Advising functions in the data not merely as a weaker form of Commanding, but as a distinct leadership strategy through which Ed builds trust and cooperation with traumatized hearers before more forceful directives become necessary.

Warning (10.9%) and Prohibition (5.0%) together form the smallest but most protectively concentrated portion of Ed's directives. Both categories share a defensive orientation, alerting hearers to danger or restricting hazardous behavior, yet they differ in

felicity threshold: Perkins (1983) and Allan (1986) note that warn requires only that the speaker draw attention to a possible negative consequence, while prohibit directly restricts an action. This distinction is visible in the data, where hedged warnings such as *"rancid smells could indicate some type of demonic activity"* coexist with unmitigated negative imperatives such as *"Just don't touch anything."* Despite their low frequency, these two categories carry disproportionate narrative weight, since they are concentrated at the exact moments where the physical or spiritual safety of a hearer is at stake, reinforcing Ervin-Tripp's (1976) observation that urgency compresses directive form even in categories not primarily associated with the bare imperative.

These functional patterns correlate closely with the narrative structure identified through Petrie and Boggs' (2021) plot framework. The concentration of directives in the Rising Action (47.1%) and Climax (19.1%) stages indicates that Ed's directive speech acts intensify precisely as supernatural threat escalates: Requesting and Advising dominate the earlier investigative phase, while Commanding, Warning, and Prohibition become proportionally more frequent as the plot approaches crisis. This distribution suggests that Ed's illocutionary force is not fixed by his institutional role alone but is dynamically recalibrated according to situational urgency, a pattern consistent with Yule's (1996) contextual view that identical speaker authority can yield markedly different directive weight depending on the moment of utterance.

Compared with previous movie-based studies of directive speech acts, the present findings offer a narrower but more concentrated pragmatic profile. Mustika and Yanti (2024), analyzing Bad Boys: Ride or Die, and Putra and Satwika (2025), analyzing Next Gen, both report directive speech acts distributed across multiple characters embedded in comedic or adventure narratives, where communicative goals are comparatively varied and low-stakes. By contrast, the present study isolates a single character operating continuously under professional and existential pressure, which explains why Requesting and Commanding together dominate the dataset far more heavily than in either comparison study. This finding aligns more closely with Biatrik et al. (2020), whose function-oriented analysis of a single antagonist in Maleficent similarly demonstrates that concentrating on

one character's directives reveals functional patterns obscured in multi-character analyses. The present study extends this single-character approach by anchoring it specifically to institutional authority and crisis escalation, a dimension not addressed in Setiawan and Juanda's (2025) persuasion-centered analysis of jury deliberation in *Twelve Angry Men*, where directive force is negotiated among equals rather than exercised from a position of specialized expertise.

Overall, these findings indicate that Ed Warren's directive speech acts function as a calibrated system rather than a fixed communicative style. Operational categories (Requesting, Commanding) manage the practical demands of investigation and ritual; Advising sustains trust and hearer autonomy; and Warning and Prohibition protect hearers at moments of acute danger. Read together, the five functions demonstrate that authority in high-stakes cinematic dialogue is not expressed through a single dominant strategy, but through the speaker's capacity to shift fluidly among mitigated, collaborative, and forceful directive forms as professional role and situational urgency demand.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the communicative functions of directive speech acts produced by Ed Warren in *The Conjuring* (2013), grounded in Searle's (1979) taxonomy of directives, Kreidler's (1998) theory of directive function, and Petrie and Boggs' (2021) narrative plot framework. Out of 101 valid directive utterances, five communicative functions were identified: Requesting (35.6%) and Commanding (30.7%) jointly dominate the dataset, reflecting Ed's task-oriented professional register during investigation and ritual execution; Advising (17.8%) sustains hearer trust and autonomy despite Ed's institutional authority; and Warning (10.9%) and Prohibition (5.0%) protect hearers at moments of acute physical or spiritual danger. These functions are not randomly distributed but intensify across the Rising Action and Climax stages of the narrative, showing that Ed's directive force is dynamically recalibrated according to situational urgency rather than fixed by his professional role alone.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that directive speech acts in high-stakes cinematic dialogue function as a calibrated leadership system rather than a single communicative style:

operational categories manage the practical demands of crisis response, while advisory and protective categories maintain trust and safety. This study contributes to pragmatic research on cinematic discourse by isolating a single, professionally authoritative character under sustained crisis, offering a more concentrated view of how institutional role and narrative urgency jointly shape directive language than is typically available in studies distributed across multiple characters. Future research may extend this approach by comparing Ed Warren's directive strategies with those of Lorraine Warren or other authority figures in crisis-driven narratives, or by examining how directive functions interact with non-verbal cues such as tone, gesture, and pacing in constructing cinematic authority.

REFERENCES

Allan, K. (1986). *Linguistic Meaning* (First Edition). Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words* (J. O. Urmson & M. Sbisà, Eds.; 2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839429693-021

Biatrik, D., Natsir, M., & Daru, S. K. (2020). The functions of directive speech acts of Maleficent character in *Maleficent* movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, 4(3), 460–475.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 25–66.

Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing English Semantics* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Mustika, E. T., & Yanti, Y. (2024). The pragmatics of directive speech acts in action-comedy film: An analysis of *Bad Boys: Ride or Die*. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 1–12.

Perkins, M. R. (1983). *Modal Expressions in English* (R. P. Fawcett, Ed.). Frances Pinter Publishers.

Petrie, D. W., & Boggs, J. M. (2021). *The Art of Watching Films* (10th ed.). McGraw Hill.

Putra, I. K. A. W. P., & Satwika, I. G. A. A. S. (2025). Directive speech acts in the animated sci-fi film *Next Gen*: A pragmatic analysis. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 13(2), 5827–5836. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609213

Setiawan, K., & Juanda. (2025). Forms of directive illocutionary acts from the main character in *Twelve Angry Men* (1957) movie. *Mahadaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 5(1), 105–114.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation* (1st ed.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies* (F. Coulmas & J. L. Mey, Eds.; 7th ed.). Mouton de Gruyter.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. In H. G. Widdowson (Ed.), *Oxford Introductions to Language Study*. Oxford University Press.