

AN ANALYSIS OF ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS IN THE MOVIE “HEADS OF STATE (2025)”

Agneso Feronika Limbong¹, Nurhayati Sitorus², Srisofian Sianturi³

e-mail: agnesoferonikalimbong@student.uhn.ac.id,

^{1,2,3}English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, HKBP
Nommensen University, Medan, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the types of illocutionary acts used by the main character in the movie Heads of State (2025) and to identify the dominant type of illocutionary act found in the movie. This research is based on pragmatic theory, particularly speech act theory proposed by Austin (1962) and further developed by Searle (1979). The study uses a qualitative descriptive method to analyze the utterances produced by the main character in the movie. The data were obtained from the main character's dialogue in several selected scenes of Heads of State (2025). The data were collected by watching the movie repeatedly, identifying the relevant utterances, and transcribing the dialogues. The analysis of the data was conducted using Searle's classification of illocutionary acts, which consists of assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative acts. The findings reveal that all five types of illocutionary acts are found in the main character's utterances in the movie. These types include assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative acts. Among these types, assertive illocutionary acts are the most dominant type used by the main character. Assertive acts are frequently used by the character to convey information, express beliefs, provide explanations, and describe situations occurring in the story. The dominance of assertive acts indicates that the main character often functions as a source of information in the development of the movie's narrative.

Keywords: Assertive; Heads Of State (2025); Illocutionary Acts; Pragmatics; Speech Acts.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis jenis-jenis tindak tutur ilokusi yang digunakan oleh tokoh utama dalam film Heads of State (2025) serta untuk mengidentifikasi jenis tindak tutur ilokusi yang paling dominan dalam film tersebut. Penelitian ini didasarkan pada kajian pragmatik, khususnya teori tindak tutur yang dikemukakan oleh Austin (1962) dan dikembangkan lebih lanjut oleh Searle (1979). Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif untuk menganalisis ujaran yang diucapkan oleh tokoh utama dalam film tersebut. Data penelitian diperoleh dari dialog tokoh utama dalam beberapa adegan terpilih dalam film Heads of State (2025). Data dikumpulkan dengan cara menonton film secara berulang, mengidentifikasi ujaran yang relevan, serta menyalin dialog yang diucapkan oleh tokoh utama. Analisis data dilakukan dengan menggunakan klasifikasi tindak tutur ilokusi dari Searle yang meliputi lima jenis, yaitu assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, dan declarative. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kelima jenis tindak tutur ilokusi tersebut ditemukan dalam ujaran tokoh utama dalam film. Jenis-jenis tersebut meliputi assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, dan declarative. Di antara kelima jenis tersebut, tindak tutur ilokusi assertive merupakan jenis yang paling dominan digunakan oleh tokoh utama. Tindak tutur assertive sering digunakan oleh tokoh utama untuk menyampaikan informasi, mengungkapkan keyakinan, memberikan penjelasan, serta menggambarkan situasi yang terjadi dalam alur cerita film.

Kata Kunci: Asertif; Head Of State (2025); Tindak Ilokusi; Pragmatic; Tindak Tutur.

Introduction

Language is a fundamental aspect of human life because it enables people to express thoughts, feelings, and intentions. Through language, humans communicate, share experiences, and build relationships in society. Language not only functions as a medium of interaction but also as a reflection of culture, values, and identity. In communication, people do not merely produce sentences; they also perform actions through those sentences. This phenomenon is studied in pragmatics, a branch of linguistics that focuses on how meaning is constructed and interpreted based on context.

One important concept in pragmatics is speech act theory. Pragmatics is the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. This perspective emphasizes that meaning is not solely determined by grammatical structure but also by contextual elements such as the relationship between speakers, the situation in which communication occurs, and the shared knowledge between participants (Yule, 1996). In addition, H.P Grice (1975) introduced the Cooperative Principle and conversational implicature, explaining how speakers and listeners cooperate to convey meaning. Similar to this, Cutting (2002) and Platridge (2006) connected pragmatics to discourse analysis by examining how topic management, coherence, and turn-taking influence communication in written texts and conversations.

Other researchers, like Barron (2003), concentrated on interlanguage pragmatics, studying how second language learners acquire pragmatic competence in cross-cultural settings. Then, Griffiths (2006) blended pragmatics and semantics, characterizing the latter as the study of "invisible meaning," which refers to interpretation that relies on shared understanding, context, and inference. Pragmatics is "the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter, and the effects their language use has on others (Crystal, 2003). These viewpoints demonstrate how pragmatics include human interaction, identity, and cognition in addition to language theory.

One of the most influential concepts in pragmatics is speech act theory. Speech act theory explains that language is not only used to convey information but also to perform actions. The theory was first introduced by J. L. Austin, who argued that when people produce utterances, they simultaneously perform certain actions. Austin classified speech acts into three categories: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. The locutionary act refers to the literal meaning of an utterance, the illocutionary act refers to the speaker's intention in producing the utterance, and the perlocutionary act refers to the effect that the utterance has on the listener. This theory was further developed by John Searle, who categorized illocutionary acts into five types: assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. These categories represent different communicative functions performed through language in everyday interaction.

Among the three levels of speech acts proposed by Austin, illocutionary acts are considered the central component because they represent the communicative intention of the speaker. Illocutionary acts refer to the act performed in saying something, such as requesting, promising, apologizing, thanking, or ordering. According to Searle's classification, assertive acts are used to state facts or describe situations, directive acts aim to make the listener perform an action, commissive acts express the speaker's commitment to future actions, expressive acts convey the speaker's psychological state, and declarative acts bring about changes in social or institutional situations when uttered by someone with authority. In everyday communication, these types of illocutionary acts frequently appear in conversations because speakers often attempt to convey intentions, influence others, or express emotions through language.

The use of illocutionary acts in communication is influenced by several contextual factors. One important factor is the relationship between speakers and listeners. Speakers who hold higher authority or social status may use directive acts more frequently to instruct or influence others. Another factor is the situational context, including the setting, topic of discussion, and communicative purpose. In certain situations, speakers may prefer specific types of speech acts depending on their communicative goals. For example, when speakers intend to influence the behavior of others, they tend to use directive acts such as commands, requests, or suggestions. These contextual factors demonstrate that the selection of

illocutionary acts is closely related to the speaker’s intentions and the social context in which communication occurs.

Moreover, speech acts have been studied by several scholars from social and linguistic perspectives. Finegan (1997), in *Language: Its Structure and Use*, speech acts in communication are reflections of social relationships and power hierarchies. According to Aitchison (1992), Language is a dynamic social system in which each utterance has the power to influence human interaction. In *Doing Pragmatics*, Grundy (2000) described how speech acts connect linguistic form with cognitive processes by revealing communicative intention and pragmatic skill. By studying the universality of speech act principles in various linguistic systems and proving that the pragmatic purposes of speech acts are discernible across languages and cultures, Owens (2000) made a valuable contribution. When taken as a whole, these theories offer a thorough comprehension of how speech acts as social and linguistic behaviors. While Grice's thesis was later extended by Geoffrey Leech (1983), who developed the Politeness Principle, demonstrating that social norms and politeness techniques to preserve harmony in interaction also influence speech acts. Speech act theory has been enhanced by other academics using sociolinguistic and cross-linguistic viewpoints.

In the modern era, language can be observed through various media such as television, the internet, and movies. Movies are considered a rich source for linguistic analysis because they present dialogues that reflect human communication in different contexts. Through movie dialogues, characters perform various speech acts that reveal intentions, emotions, and social relationships. Therefore, analyzing speech acts in movie dialogues can provide insights into how language functions as a form of social action.

One movie that presents diverse communicative interactions is *Heads of State (2025)*. The dialogue between characters in this movie reflects different uses of language depending on the context and situation. The main character often produces utterances that represent different types of illocutionary acts, such as giving commands, expressing opinions, making commitments, or showing emotional responses. These utterances illustrate how language is used to perform communicative actions that influence other characters and contribute to the development of the story.

Several previous studies have examined illocutionary acts in movie dialogues. For example, Rein & Junaedi (2025) analyzed the types and functions of illocutionary acts in the movie *Frozen II* and found five types of illocutionary acts based on Searle’s classification. Similarly, Turnip et al. (2024) analyzed illocutionary acts in the film *Einstein and the Bomb* and identified dominant patterns of speech acts used by the characters. Another study by Yayu & Simatupang (2023) examined illocutionary acts in the movie *Fast X* and showed how these speech acts support character interaction and narrative development. However, most of these studies mainly focus on identifying the types and distribution of illocutionary acts without deeply examining the dominant patterns used by the main character in a specific context.

Another study conducted by Arnoi et al. (2024), entitled *A Pragmatic Study: Illocutionary Acts in 'Yowes Ben 2' Movie*, explored the distribution of illocutionary act types in the movie dialogue and identified dominant categories based on frequency. While this research contributes to understanding how illocutionary acts construct meaning in cinematic dialogue, it mainly focuses on classification and does not extend its analysis to communicative functions or interactional responses. Similarly, Rosalinah et al. (2024) analyzed the use of illocutionary acts in *Exploring the Illocutionary Act in 'The Beekeeper' (2024)*. Their research identified the dominant types of illocutionary acts used by the main character and explained how speech acts support character roles and narrative development in action films such as *The Beekeeper*. However, the study did not examine the communicative functions in depth nor analyze the responses of other characters.

Based on this phenomenon, the researcher is interested in analyzing the illocutionary acts used by the main character in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*. This study focuses on identifying the types

of illocutionary acts and determining the most dominant type used by the main character. The analysis aims to provide a deeper understanding of how language functions as a communicative action in movie dialogues and how pragmatic elements shape character interaction. Although several studies have examined the functions of illocutionary acts in movies, such studies are still limited, previous studies has not addressed the factors contributing to the dominance of specific illocutionary acts. In particular, aspects such as the character’s role, situational context, and communicative purpose used by the main character. Therefore, this study analyzes these factors to explain the dominance of illocutionary acts and to deepen the understanding of what influences the main character’s use of illocutionary acts.

Therefore, the problems of this study are: (1) what types of illocutionary acts are used by the main character in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*, and which type is the most dominant? (2). What are the functions of those Illocutionary acts in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*? (3. What factors influence the dominance of certain types of illocutionary acts used by the main character in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*? The objective of this research are (1) to identify the types of illocutionary acts used by the main character in the movie *Heads of State (2025)* and determine the most dominant type. (2) To describe the functions of those Illocutionary acts in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*; and (3) To identify and analyze the factors that contribute to the dominance of certain types of illocutionary acts used by the main character in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*. The findings of this study are expected to contribute theoretically to the study of pragmatics, particularly speech act theory, and practically to students, researchers, and language learners who are interested in understanding how illocutionary acts function in movie dialogues as representations of real-life communication.

Method

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to analyze the illocutionary acts found in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*. Qualitative research is appropriate for exploring and interpreting language use within its social and situational context. According to Creswell (2014), qualitative research aims to explore and understand the meaning that individuals or groups attribute to a social phenomenon. In this study, language was viewed as a form of social action rather than merely a system of grammatical structures. Therefore, the qualitative descriptive approach enabled the researcher to describe and interpret the types of illocutionary acts used by the main character in the movie.

The data of this research consisted of utterances produced by the main character in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*. The utterances were taken from dialogues that contained illocutionary acts, including assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative acts. The source of data was the movie *Heads of State (2025)* directed by Ilya Naishuller. This movie was selected because it presents various communicative interactions within political and social contexts. The dialogues among the characters reflect authentic communication involving authority, persuasion, cooperation, and emotional expression, making the movie suitable for pragmatic analysis.

The instrument of this research was the researcher as the primary instrument, because qualitative research requires the researcher to directly collect, interpret, and analyze the data. According to Miles et al. (2014), the researcher plays a central role in selecting relevant data and interpreting meaning in qualitative studies. To support the analysis, the researcher also used several supporting tools such as movie transcripts, note-taking sheets, and data classification tables based on the theory of illocutionary acts proposed by Searle (1979).

The technique for collecting data was conducted through several steps. First, the researcher watched the movie *Heads of State (2025)* repeatedly to understand the storyline and the context of the dialogue. Second, the researcher transcribed the dialogues spoken by the main character to ensure that all relevant utterances were accurately recorded. Third, the researcher selected utterances that contained illocutionary acts. Finally, the selected utterances were classified into five categories of illocutionary acts based on Searle’s theory: assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

The data analysis technique followed the qualitative analysis model proposed by Miles et al. (2014), which consists of three stages: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. In the data condensation stage, the researcher selected and focused on relevant utterances containing illocutionary acts. In the data display stage, the classified data were presented in tables and descriptive explanations to identify patterns of speech acts used by the main character. In the final stage, the researcher interpreted the findings and drew conclusions regarding the types of illocutionary acts and the most dominant type found in the movie.

To ensure the credibility of the findings, triangulation was applied in this research. According to Denzin (1978), triangulation is used to validate research findings through multiple perspectives. This study applied data source triangulation by comparing utterances from different scenes, theory triangulation by using theories from Austin (1962) and Searle (1979), and researcher triangulation through consultation with academic supervisors and peer discussions. These procedures helped ensure that the interpretation of illocutionary acts was reliable and theoretically grounded.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the findings and discussion of the analysis of illocutionary acts used by the main characters in the movie *Heads of State (2025)*. The analysis is based on Searle’s (1979) classification of illocutionary acts, which includes five types: assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

Results

The results show that all five types of illocutionary acts appear in the movie dialogue. However, the frequency of each type varies, indicating different communicative functions within the narrative. The distribution of illocutionary acts is presented in Table 1

Tabel 1 Bobot Panjang Bagian Badan Artikel

No.	Types of Illocutionary Acts	Frequency	Percentage
1	Assertive	47	61,04 %
2	Directive	18	23,38 %.
3	Commissive	7	9.09 %
4	Expressive	4	5,19 %
5	Declarative	1	1,30 %
	Total	77	100%

The table shows that assertive illocutionary acts are the most dominant type, appearing 47 times (61.04%) in the data. Assertive acts are used when the speaker conveys information, expresses beliefs, explains situations, or states opinions. The high frequency of assertive acts indicates that the characters frequently use language to describe events, clarify circumstances, and provide explanations related to political or operational situations occurring in the storyline.

This dominance reflects the narrative structure of the movie, where the main characters often function as sources of information and decision makers. In many scenes, the characters explain strategic conditions, evaluate threats, and provide arguments regarding political decisions. As a result, assertive acts become the primary communicative tool used to construct meaning and guide the development of the plot. For example, Sam Clark states, “*Energy security is national security.*” This utterance is classified as an assertive illocutionary act with the function of asserting because the speaker strongly emphasizes the importance of energy independence as a national principle. The utterance reflects ideological positioning and is influenced by communicative purpose since the speaker intends to reinforce a political message. Similarly, Will Derringer states, “*We have the tools and we have the technology to find and destroy them if they challenge us.*” This utterance is also categorized as an

assertive act because the speaker expresses confidence regarding national capability and military strength. The utterance functions to project power and reinforce deterrence toward potential enemies.

The second most frequent type is directive illocutionary acts, which occur 18 times (23.38%). Directive acts are used to give commands, requests, or instructions intended to influence the actions of others. The presence of directive acts in the movie reflects the hierarchical relationships among the characters, particularly in situations involving leadership, operational coordination, and crisis management. Through directives, characters attempt to control actions, coordinate teamwork, and respond quickly to urgent situations. For example, Noel Bisset says, “*Field team, abort!*” This utterance is categorized as a directive illocutionary act functioning as commanding because Noel directly orders the team to stop the operation immediately. The utterance reflects urgency and crisis control in a dangerous situation. Another example can be seen when Sam Clark states, “*Take it all down several notches, everyone.*” This utterance also functions as a command because the speaker instructs others to calm down and de-escalate the situation. The utterance reflects institutional authority and diplomatic control as a national leader.

Meanwhile, commissive illocutionary acts appear 7 times (9.09%). Commissive acts occur when speakers commit themselves to future actions, such as promising, agreeing, or guaranteeing something. In the movie, commissive acts are commonly found in political discussions and strategic planning, where leaders make commitments related to cooperation, protection, or future decisions. These acts contribute to the development of trust and responsibility among the characters. For example, Sam Clark states, “*We aren’t making any promises except that we will work tirelessly to get results.*” This utterance is categorized as a commissive illocutionary act because the speaker commits to continuous effort and responsibility in achieving political results. Likewise, Will Derringer says, “*We will do better.*” This utterance reflects a promise of improvement and future action, showing the speaker’s commitment to change and accountability.

In contrast, expressive illocutionary acts occur only 4 times (5.19%), indicating that emotional expression is not the primary focus of the dialogue. Expressive acts are used to convey feelings such as concern, frustration, or anxiety, particularly in moments of tension or uncertainty. Although limited in number, these acts play an important role in humanizing the characters and revealing their emotional reactions to critical situations. For example, Will Derringer says, “*Goddamn it!*” This utterance is categorized as an expressive illocutionary act because it reflects spontaneous anger and frustration during a tense situation. Similarly, Noel Bisset states, “*Coop, I don’t like this van.*” This utterance expresses concern and suspicion toward a potentially dangerous situation, reflecting emotional unease and intuition.

The last frequent type is declarative illocutionary acts, which appear only once (1.30%) in the data. Declarative acts occur when the speaker’s utterance creates a new institutional or social reality, such as announcing an official decision or establishing an agreement. The rarity of declarative acts in the movie indicates that only characters with institutional authority can perform such speech acts. Therefore, declarative acts tend to appear only in formal political contexts where the speaker has legitimate power to change a social or political status. For example, Will Derringer formally announces, “*We are now partners in energy.*” This utterance is categorized as a declarative illocutionary act because the speaker officially establishes a political and economic partnership through his institutional authority as a national leader.

The dominance of assertive acts in the movie can be explained by several influencing factors. First, the role of the speaker significantly affects language use. Characters who hold positions of authority, such as political leaders and operational commanders, frequently use assertive and directive acts to construct legitimacy and demonstrate leadership. Second, the context of the situation plays a crucial role. Many scenes involve high-risk operations, diplomatic negotiations, and political conflicts, which require clear and accurate information. These conditions naturally encourage the use of assertive acts to provide explanations and justify decisions.

Third, the communicative purpose of the dialogue shapes the form of the utterances. Most conversations are intended to inform, persuade, explain, and coordinate actions among the characters. Consequently, assertive acts dominate the discourse because they effectively deliver information and construct shared understanding among participants. These findings indicate that illocutionary acts in the movie function not only as linguistic expressions but also as strategic tools for constructing authority, leadership, and political identity. The frequent use of assertive and directive acts demonstrates how language is used to manage situations, influence others, and shape interpretations of events. In this sense, the dialogue in *Heads of State (2025)* reflects the role of language as a form of social action within institutional and political contexts. Overall, the analysis shows that the communicative structure of the movie is dominated by assertive discourse, supported by directive acts that regulate action and coordination. This pattern reflects the pragmatic characteristics of political communication, where language is used to convey information, justify decisions, and maintain authority within complex social interactions.

Discussion

Based on the findings of this study, the dominant type of illocutionary act found in *Heads of State (2025)* is assertive, with a total percentage of 61.04%. This dominance indicates that the primary communicative function in the movie is the construction of statements, arguments, evaluations, and explanations. The characters, especially those holding political and institutional positions, frequently use language to state beliefs, clarify situations, justify decisions, and frame political realities. The prevalence of assertive acts reflects the argumentative and strategic nature of political discourse, where language becomes a tool to shape perception and reinforce authority rather than merely to express emotion or issue commands.

This finding is in line with the study conducted by Rein and Junaedi (2025), who also found that assertive acts were dominant in their analysis of *Frozen II*. However, while their study showed that assertive acts were mainly used to explain events and express personal beliefs within a narrative context, the present study reveals a different pragmatic orientation. In *Heads of State*, assertive acts are strongly influenced by institutional roles and political intentions. The statements delivered by political leaders' function not only as information-sharing but also as strategic positioning in diplomatic and crisis situations. Therefore, although both studies share similar quantitative results, the contextual interpretation differs significantly due to genre and discourse setting.

Furthermore, the finding that directive acts rank second (23.38%) supports the idea that hierarchical and operational communication plays an important role in the movie. This result partially aligns with the research conducted by Yuyu and Simatupang (2023), who found frequent directive acts in the action movie *Fast X*. However, unlike their study, which mainly categorized directives based on form and function, the present research emphasizes the influence of the speaker's institutional role. In *Heads of State*, directives are predominantly delivered by characters who possess legitimate authority, such as operational leaders or political figures. This suggests that directive force is closely connected to institutional hierarchy and power relations, reinforcing Searle's notion that illocutionary force depends not only on linguistic structure but also on social context.

In addition, commissive acts account for 9.09% of the total data and are mostly found in diplomatic discussions and public statements. This finding is comparable to Rosalinah et al. (2024), who identified commissive acts as contributing to character development in *The Beekeeper*. However, in the present study, commissive acts serve a more political function. Promises and commitments made by leaders are not merely personal expressions of future intention but are strategic acts to build credibility, maintain alliances, and demonstrate responsibility. Thus, commissive acts in this movie function as instruments of political legitimacy rather than solely as narrative devices.

The limited occurrence of expressive acts 5.19% indicates that emotional expression is not the primary communicative focus in the movie. This contrasts with Arnoi et al. (2024), whose findings showed a stronger presence of expressive acts in films centered on interpersonal relationships. The

difference may be explained by genre variation. As a political-action film, *Heads of State* prioritizes strategic communication and institutional interaction over emotional dialogue. Similarly, declarative acts appear only once (1.30%), which supports Searle’s theory that declaratives require institutional authority to create changes in social reality. The rarity of declaratives in this study confirms that such acts occur only in formal and legitimate political contexts.

Overall, when compared with previous related studies, this research confirms that assertive acts often dominate film discourse. However, it also demonstrates that the distribution and function of illocutionary acts are highly influenced by genre, institutional structure, and communicative purpose. Unlike previous studies that mainly focused on classification and frequency, this study provides a deeper contextual interpretation by analyzing the role of the speaker, the context of the situation, and the communicative purpose behind each utterance. Therefore, the findings contribute to pragmatic studies by showing that illocutionary acts in political films are systematically shaped by power relations, authority, and strategic discourse goals.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion of this study, several conclusions can be drawn. First, all five types of illocutionary acts proposed by Searle (1979), namely assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative, were identified in the movie *Heads of State* (2025). Among these types, assertive illocutionary acts were found to be the most dominant, occurring 47 times or 61.04% of the total data. Assertive acts were predominantly used by the characters to convey information, express opinions and beliefs, explain situations, and describe events within the narrative. The dominance of assertive acts indicates that the main characters primarily function as sources of information and explanation throughout the development of the movie’s storyline.

Second, the findings reveal that each type of illocutionary act performs different communicative functions depending on the speaker’s intention and the situational context. Assertive acts function to inform, explain, argue, and express opinions; directive acts function to command, request, advise, and question; commissive acts function to express promises and commitments; expressive acts function to convey emotional states and psychological reactions; while declarative acts function to establish institutional or political realities through official utterances. These functions demonstrate that language in the movie operates not only as a medium of communication but also as a form of social action used to influence interaction and construct meaning.

Third, the dominance of assertive illocutionary acts is influenced by several contextual factors, namely the role of the speaker, the context of the situation, and the communicative purpose of the utterances. Characters occupying positions of institutional authority, such as political leaders and operational commanders, tend to employ assertive and directive acts to justify decisions, provide explanations, and manage situations. Furthermore, the political, diplomatic, and strategic contexts represented in the movie encourage the use of language emphasizing information delivery, argumentation, and clarification. In addition, the communicative purposes underlying the interactions, such as persuading, informing, and maintaining authority, significantly contribute to the frequent use of assertive acts.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the field of pragmatics, particularly speech act theory, by providing a contextual analysis of illocutionary acts within political and institutional movie discourse. The findings support Searle’s theory that the use of illocutionary acts is closely related to communicative intention and social context. Moreover, this study extends previous research by not only identifying the types of illocutionary acts but also examining their communicative functions and the factors influencing their dominance in cinematic interaction.

Practically, the findings of this study are expected to provide useful insights for students, researchers, and English language learners in understanding the application of illocutionary acts in real-life communication represented through movie dialogue. In addition, this study may serve as a reference for the teaching of pragmatics, particularly in relation to how language is used to express authority,

persuasion, emotion, and social relationships in different communicative contexts. For future research, it is recommended that researchers examine illocutionary acts in different movie genres or conduct comparative studies across multiple films in order to obtain broader pragmatic perspectives. Future studies may also investigate other pragmatic aspects, such as perlocutionary acts, politeness strategies, conversational implicature, or interactional responses, in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of communication in cinematic discourse.

Bibliography

- Aitchison, J. (1992). *Language change: Progress or decay?* Cambridge University Press.
- Arnoi, A., Prasetyo, Y., & Lestari, D. (2024). A pragmatic study: Illocutionary acts in Yowes Ben 2 movie. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Studies*, 6(1), 45–56.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Learning How to Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th Edition). Sage Publications.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge.
- Finegan, E. (1997). *Language: Its structure and use* (3 (ed.)). Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics. *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics*. Arnold.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd Edition). Sage Publications.
- Owens, R. (2000). *Language, culture, and society*. Wadsworth.
- Platride, B. (2006). *Brian Paltridge Discourse Analysis An In (1)* (p. 117).
- Rein, R., & Junaedi, J. (2025). An analysis of illocutionary acts in movie script of Frozen II. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 9(1), 12–22.
- Rosalinah, R., Fitriani, F., & Saputra, M. (2024). Exploring the illocutionary act in The Beekeeper. *International Journal of Pragmatics and Communication*, 5(2), 78–89.
- Turnip, M. R., Simanjuntak, H., & Sihotang, P. (2024). An analysis of illocutionary speech acts in the film Einstein and the Bomb. *Journal of Linguistic Research*, 8(2), 101–112.
- Yayu, Y., & Simatupang, E. (2023). The illocutionary acts in Fast X movie. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Studies*, 7(3), 55–66.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Oxford Introductions to Language Study Series Editor H.G.Widdowson Pragmatics George Yule*. 138.