



Analysis of language in political communication: speech acts of Dwi's confession in house of representatives meeting

Anindias Aurilia Insani¹ ✉, Universitas PGRI Madiun,

Rosita Ambarwati² ✉, Universitas PGRI Madiun

✉ diasaurilia12@gmail.com; rosita@unipma.ac.id

Abstract: This study analyses speech acts in Dwi confession during a House of Representatives meeting and the interplay of language in power relations. Employing Speech Act Theory and qualitative analysis, the research categorized 153 sentences into five types: Assertives, Directives, Expressives, Commissives. As pertains to participation type, Assertive were written in eighty-seven cases and informals whereas directives peoplere thirty-four informals written to influence committee members. Peculiarities of the gendered and formal, high-stakes language include speech acts with specific purposes necessary for controlling others and realising political objectives. The outcomes support different political judgments and prove multifaceted work of language in legislative contexts and show that it is also a performative tool. This research adds to the body of knowledge on the relationship between language and institutions in political communication. The researcher hopes that future research can examine cross-cultural and non-verbal analysis of political communication to increase validity of studies in the field of linguistics.

Keyword: *Speech Acts, Language, Political Communication, Education, Linguistics*



INTRODUCTION

Language is a basic instrument for people's interaction does not only transmit information, but also functions to give actions determining social and political contexts. Language can be conveyed in the form of oral or voice, written or written, and gestures or movements. People are use language to communicate, namely conveying their feelings, thoughts, and information. Language can be used to build relationships between individuals and groups. The use of language also allows people to transfer knowledge from one generation to another. Language can be used in two main situations: formal situations and informal situations.

Language has many parts, one of which is Speech acts. Speech acts delivered by people when communicating that not only convey information but will also perform certain actions as a result of the interaction (Austin, 1962). Speech acts have functions as a means of effective communication and a means of social affirmation. Speech acts as effective communication means that speech acts help individuals to interact and convey desires clearly (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Speech acts as social affirmation means that speech acts help individuals to build and maintain social relationships with appropriate language (Goffman, 1967). Speech acts are always present in all the communication we do in interacting with each other.

Speech acts exist in all areas of our lives, especially in politics. Speech acts being that people are the units of language used to build that language is useful in defining some of the interactions in instantaneous institutional structures such as government hearings. Speech act effectiveness provides many insights into popular issues in the political and legislative areas.

Some time ago there was a case where a bakery employee suffered persecution from the son of the owner of the bakery where he worked. The employee, named Dwi, suffered a bleeding wound to his head because he was pelted with items in the cake shop. All of these events were recorded by a person who was in the shop when the incident occurred. The video went viral on X app or Twitter and other social media. Then the victim managed to report the incident to the police and a discussion was held in a meeting with Commission III of the Indonesian Parliament. The meeting was held on Tuesday, December 17, 2024 which was broadcast live on the Youtube page. At the meeting there was communication interaction between Dwi and The Head of Commission III The House of Representatives, Mr. Habiburokhman.

The House of Representatives as a legislative discourse represents a social environment in which many speech acts can lead to significant changes in legislation and public perception of issues. Based on the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Archive (2020), on speech acts in formal contexts, and the ways in which people enter into these relations and perpetuate institutional power. Language is essential to any legal system and part of the legal system for organization, communication, and problem solving.

Various legal philosophers have pointed to language as the key to understanding the craft of law; linguistic performances elicit legal norms. Moreover, ideas and language are useful to the state as people serve to build and maintain political authority and construct state's power and coercive capabilities, manipulate public opinion, and justify power.

The study is based on the speech act theory by Michael J.L. Austin and John R. Searle which underlines the use of language does not only have referential function but also performative. Anthropologically, this theory offers a stable ground for analyzing

such expressions because in their formal aspect where performativity is vital, has been accentuated in various linguistic crossing over.

There are four types of speech acts that may occur in a political meeting situation in this case, namely assertive, directive, expressive, and commissive. The type of language activity employed in the form of constative speech act implicates Dwi to provide reflective and analytically rich data on how people tend to use language to accept culpability and conduct detailed informational transactions in officially prescribed environment.

In political processes, speech acts are used to generate support, to prompt action or to introduce policies. For example, research from Toisuta and Aritonang (2024) has revealed how the political leaders employ directives in explaining global problems, and mobilizing people to act collectively.

In the political sphere, assertives are employed to build up or disseminate facts or facts and figures justifying certain actions or policies. For Example, studies have shown that political actors employ assertive acts to haggle believability and reliability with the audience.

Speech acts also have a substantial impact on political discourses and public attitude and emotional disposition. For example, Maíz-Arévalo (2017) argues that by expressing own emotions politicians are able to deepen trust with voters and sway the opinion of the public. There are sentences such as thanking and praising which are included in Expressive speech acts. For example, the results of research from Ambarwati et.al. (2018), who has analyzed expressive speech acts from women's comment on Facebook which define that two sentences type, Thanking is the activity to get appreciation and to show that you are happy for something and Praise can be described as the expression of approval or admiration to; commend; or celebrate.

The examination of confessions and testimonies in governmental hearings still stays as most significant and fascinating field of interest which gives understanding about the interconnection between the language and power and institutional practices. According to Galyashina (2016) about the recent case studies in forensic linguistics then show the impact of the voice and language analysis for understanding reliability and the interpretation of oral or the written words in the court cases. For example, research by Rizzelli & Gales (2021) discussed linguistic differences that directly relate true and false confessions namely personal pronouns, impersonal pronouns, and conjunctions.

Dwi's confessional speech at the House of Representatives is useful to examine these speech acts in the legislative context formally. According to Moreland-Russel et. al. (2015), narratives in such settings have been important for studying how personal stories shape public policy and attitudes. People are employed in order to offer the lawmakers evidence and opinion that may go a long way in either paving the way for the creation of legislation, modification or the rejection of existing policies and or regulations.

The research by Evizariza (2024) said that there are investigations on the application of speech acts in parliamentary discourses and in political speeches on the role of testimonial in legislative contexts. In analysing directive, assertive and expressive speech acts in Dwi's confessions, people aim to identify the sources and use of power that has been manifested. This analysis will help to understand how people are using language when functioning in power relations, when describing themselves, and when possibly impacting legislation. It is important to comprehend what some of these speech

acts mean for strategic political communication, particularly in stressful situations such as the meetings in the House of Representatives.

This research defines the following Specific research questions for this study: The speech acts that are involved in Dwi's confession are as follows: to assess how the pragmatic properties and sequence of the speech acts under consideration within the context of a House of Representatives meeting, to examine the performative aspect of language in Dwi's confession in relation to its interpretation and possible consequences, and to advance the current knowledge of what speaks in the formal governmental context.

This article focuses on a case study: Analyzing Dwi, an employee of a bakery store, said a confession during a meeting of the House of Representatives. This paper aims to raise the understanding of how language works as an instrument of performance in intense situations.

This studies' aim not only to the development of the academic theory known as speech act theory but also to the course of practical application specifically in political discourse analysis of political performance and political communication generally where the individual first-person testimony comes into direct conflict with the general overall policy talk. Thus, it makes it important for linguists, political scientists, as well as the policymakers, as provide insight into role of language in the realignment of the political paradigms.

METHOD

This research uses a qualitative paradigm to examine speech acts in a particular meeting of the House of Representatives involving Dwi, who is an employee of a bakery. The study was informed by Speech Act Theory pioneered by J.L. Austin and advanced by John Searle which argues that language is used for expressing information as well as for doing things. The use of this theoretical framework will permit us to analyse the linguistic and pragmatic features of Dwi's confession in the light of the given context of the meeting. The analysis process in which the confession will be transcribed followed by coding in according to Speech Act Theory. The researcher conducted a review of the transcript aiming to categorize the particular speech acts narrated on the basis of the divisions given by Searle.

FINDINGS

Analyzing the content of Dwi's confession made at the meeting with the House of Representatives it was possible to identify the multiple speech acts that are intertwined in this case, as well as to describe the communicative conventions used in high-risk political environment. The qualitative analysis, based on transcriptions of the meeting and contextual observations with The Head of Commission III House of Representatives of Indonesia, Mr. Habiburokhman & Ms. Dwi:

TABLE 1. The transcript from the video of the confession of Dwi at house of representatives meeting.

Habiburokhman	:	<i>Mana yang duluan? Silahkan sampaikan kronologisnya sejak awal, ya. Sejak awal sampai hari ini, penanganan hari ini. Tenang aja, Mbak. Kita jamin keamanan Anda. Silahkan, Mbak.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh. Saya mau menceritakan tentang kejadian yang saya alami. Jadi, posisinya saya kan lagi kerja.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Tanggal berapa itu, Mbak Dwi?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Tanggal 17 Oktober jam 9 malam (21.00 WIB).</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jam 9 malam, 2024, ya?</i>

		<i>di Besar Tungguan.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Si pelaku dari luar masuk ke dalam toko. Terus duduk di sofa, terus dia mesen go-food. Setelah abang go-foodnya dateng, di situ dia nyuruh saya ngantarin makanannya ke kamar pribadinya. Terus di situ saya nolak, karena di situ bukan tugas saya juga, makanya saya nolak. Ada hal lain juga, dari sebelum kejadian ini dia juga pernah ngatain saya miskin, babu. Terus dia juga sempet ngomong "orang miskin kayak lu, gak bisa masukin gua ke penjara, gua nih kebal hukum". Dia sempet ngomong kayak gitu, terus saya di situ mau resign, tapi ditahan sama adiknya si pelaku. Akhirnya kita, saya dan karyawan yang lain, minta untuk bikin perjanjian kalau saya gak mau ngantarin makanan si pelaku lagi. Dari situ saya nolak, pas saya nolak berkali-kali dia ngelempar saya pake patung, terus ngelempar saya pake bangku. Habis itu ngelempar saya pake mesin EDC BCA, habis itu saya ditarik sama ayahnya si pelaku. Terus karena HP sama tas saya masih di dalam, akhirnya saya balik lagi ke dalam. Tapi saya malah di lempar lagi pake kursi, akhirnya saya kabur ke belakang ke tempat banyak oven. Di situ saya gak bisa kemana-mana, akhirnya saya di lempar lagi pake barang-barang. Terus yang endingnya di situ saya di lempar pake loyang kue sampai kepala saya berdarah</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jadi berkali-kali itu, Mbak ya? dari jam sembilan itu ya. Pertama setelah dia minta Mbak Dwi mengantarkan makanan enggak mau, dia sudah melakukan, nepar. Ya, waktu mau pulang dihempar lagi sampai kena, itu kena semua, itu ya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Kena semua ke badan saya semua.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke badan, gak ada yang nolong waktu itu? gak ada temen-temen yang lain gak ada ya di sini ya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Ga ada, saya disitu cuma berdua, sama teman saya satu.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, terus sampai akhirnya waktu mengambil handphone itu di lempar, Mbak Dwi tersudut ya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Kena kepala itu ya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Kepala...</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Itu yang ada bocor di foto itu, ya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Gitu ya. Nah, terus apa yang terjadi, Mbak?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Terus itu pas udah berdarah, tapi saya nggak tahu kalau disitu udah berdarah tapi saya udah megangin kepala saya begini. Terus dia mungkin dia udah ngeliat duluan darah, terus gue kabur ke belakang, baru saya bisa kabur keluar toko.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Yang dia ngomong apa, "saya kebal hukum" itu sebelum melakukan apa setelah melakukan?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Itu, dia kejadian sebelum ini.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jadi ada kejadian lain sebelum kejadian itu?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Tanggal berapa kejadian lain?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Bulan September.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oh, jadi sering dia melakukan hal seperti ini? selain kepada Mbak Dwi ada kepada yang lain juga?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Kenapa?</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Selain kepada Mbak Dwi, karyawan lain ada dilakukan juga?</i>

Dwi	:	<i>Kalau ke karyawan yang lain mungkin dari mulut aja.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Omongan, verbal. Oke, tapi yang Mbak Dwi bulan September sudah pernah dilempar juga?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya, tapi di situ dia lempar saya pakai tempat solasi, itu kena kaki saya. Kalau terus dia juga lempar saya pakai meja tapi enggak kena.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Kena kaki?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Kalau terus dia juga lempar saya pakai meja tapi enggak kena.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Gak kena. Nah, yang makanya dia ngomong karena merujuk ke kejadian yang sebelumnya, bahwa dia kebal hukum. Oke, setelah berdarah, Mbak dibawa ke rumah sakit gitu? Ke klinik, Penggilingan situ?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Ke klinik.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke klinik, Penggilingan situ? Oke, lanjut.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Terus habis kejadian itu langsung lapor ke Polsek Cakung. Eh, Ramangun dulu, tapi di situ emang gak bisa nangani, karena akhirnya di Cakung juga gak bisa nangani juga.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke Polsek Cakung.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Eh, Ramangun dulu, tapi di situ emang gak bisa nangani, karena akhirnya di Cakung juga gak bisa nangani juga.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Rawamangun?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya, tapi di situ emang gak bisa nanganin, karena...</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, kejadiannya di Cakung.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Akhirnya dirujuk ke Cakung dan di Ckung juga gak bisa nangani juga.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Kenapa yang Rawamangun menolak? Apa alasannya waktu itu?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Mungkin, TKP nya</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>TKP, Oke.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Akhirnya saya disuruh ke Polres Jati Negara, Jakarta Timur.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke Polres Jakarta Timur di Jati Negara. Itu hari itu juga? hari yang sama?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Hari itu juga.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jadi hari itu, Mbak, balak balik ke tiga kantor polisi?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Di antar siapa?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Eh teman-teman sama keluarga.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, 17 Oktober, Mbak, balik balik tiga kator polisi akhirnya diterima di Polres Jakarta Timur di Jati Negara itu ya? Oke lanjut.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Eh, Paginya langsung fisum. Terus...</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Fisum.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Ada cerita juga yang tentang pengacaranya. Saya sempat dikasih, dikirimkan pengacara dari pihak pelaku.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ohh.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Tapi awalnya saya nggak tahu kalau itu dari pihak pelaku.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Heeh.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Dia ngakunya dari LBH, utusan dari Polda.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oh, LBH utusan dari Polda?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya, dia ngakunya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>LBH apa? Di sebutin aja mungkin.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Kurang tau, dia ngomongnya itu aja.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, ngakui dari LBH ya, tapi mbak belakangan tahu itu dari pelaku.</i>

Dwi	:	<i>Awalnya ga tau.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Terus pas pertemuan di Polres pengen BAP. Disitu dia ngasih kasih tau, kalo dia disuruh sama bos saya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Siapa namanya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Eh... nama pengacaranya?</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Eggak, Pengacaranya siapa namanya? Bosnya siapa namanya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Pengacaranya saya ga tau namanya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Iya, nama bos Anda siapa?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Linda.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oh, Bu Linda, ya? Makanya namanya Linda. Oke, lanjut, lanjut.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Akhirnya, mama saya ganti pengacara.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Heeh</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Disitu pengacara yang keduanya, kaya nggak...kalau saya tanya tentang gimana kelanjutannya, dia selalu jawab “sedang diproses” “sedang diproses”.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke pengacara itu?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Heeh</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Yang dikirim si itu? Atau pengacara lain berikutnya? Pengacara kedua?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Sama juga, ngakunya dari Polda? Bukan?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Bukan.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Dia setiap ada info selalu ke rumah dan minta duit. Mamah saya sampai jual motor.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jual motor?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya. Motor satu satunya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ya Allah. Oke, lanjut lanjut. Lanjut, santai aja.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Habis jual motor itu eh...saya tanya-tanyain. Itu udah ga ada kontak, ga bisa dihubungin lagi.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Pengacaranya ilang? Ghosting-lah.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Dia eh...saya dihubungi oleh Pak Jainudin.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, dari tim ini ya? Timnya Pak Jon, ya?</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Saya juga dikasih bantuan oleh Bang Jon eh... kerja di Perusahaan Hi-Five, sama saya juga dikuliahkan di universitas terbaik di Jakarta.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>
Dwi	:	<i>Sampai lulus.</i>
Habiburokhman	:	<i>Alhamdulillah, ditolong ya. Jadi, selanjutnya didampingi tim lawyer-nya dari Pak Jon, ya? Sampai akhirnya ditangkap, terus mungkin tim advokasinya.</i>

The transcript of Dwi's video confession at the Commission III House of Representatives meeting shows that Habiburokhman, Chairman of Commission III House of Representatives, asked many questions about the clarity of the incident. Dwi also goes into detail about the incident at the bakery, the filing of the case with the police, and the lawyer in the case. In some situation, Dwi seemed to find it difficult to recount the incident and Mr. Habiburokhman calmed Dwi down several times with statements such as “Tenang” and “Relax”. Habiburokhman also often reacted to statements made by Dwi

with words like “Oke”, “Iya”, and “Heeh”. Habiburokhman also gave reactions such as “Alhamdulillah” and “Ya Allah” which can all be analyzed in his Speech Acts. Here are the results of the speech acts analysis from the transcript above:

TABLE 2. The results of speech acts analysis from the video of the confession of Dwi at house of representatives meeting.

No	SPEAKER	SENTENCES	SPEECH ACTS TYPE
1.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Mana yang duluan?</i>	Directive
2.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Silahkan sampaikan kronologisnya sejak awal, ya.</i>	Directive
3.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Sejak awal sampai hari ini, penanganan hari ini.</i>	Assertive
4.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Tenang aja, Mbak.</i>	Commissive
5.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Kita jamin keamanan Anda.</i>	Commissive
6.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Silahkan, Mbak.</i>	Directive
7.	Dwi	: <i>Assalamualaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.</i>	Expressive
8.	Dwi	: <i>Saya mau menceritakan tentang kejadian yang saya alami.</i>	Assertive
9.	Dwi	: <i>Jadi, posisinya saya kan lagi kerja.</i>	Assertive
10.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Tanggal berapa itu, Mbak Dwi?</i>	Directive
11.	Dwi	: <i>Tanggal 17 Oktober jam 9 malam.</i>	Assertive
12.	Habiburokhman	: <i>Jam 9 malam, 2024, ya? di Besar Tungguan.</i>	Assertive
13.	Dwi	: <i>Si pelaku dari luar masuk ke dalam toko.</i>	Assertive
14.	Dwi	: <i>Terus duduk di sofa, terus dia mesen go-food.</i>	Assertive
15.	Dwi	: <i>Setelah abang go-foodnya datang, di situ dia nyuruh saya ngantarin makanannya ke kamar pribadinya.</i>	Directive
16.	Dwi	: <i>Terus di situ saya nolak, karena di situ bukan tugas saya juga, makanya saya nolak.</i>	Assertive
17.	Dwi	: <i>Ada hal lain juga, dari sebelum kejadian ini dia juga pernah ngatain saya miskin, babu.</i>	Assertive
18.	Dwi	: <i>Terus dia juga sempet ngomong "orang miskin kayak lu, gak bisa masukin gua ke penjara, gua nih kebal hukum".</i>	Assertive
19.	Dwi	: <i>Dia sempet ngomong kayak gitu, terus saya di situ mau resign, tapi ditahan sama adiknya si pelaku.</i>	Assertive
20.	Dwi	: <i>Akhirnya kita, saya dan karyawan yang lain, minta untuk bikin perjanjian kalau saya gak mau ngantarin makanan si pelaku lagi.</i>	Directive
21.	Dwi	: <i>Dari situ saya nolak, pas saya nolak berkali-kali dia ngelempar saya pake patung, terus ngelempar saya pake bangku.</i>	Assertive
22.	Dwi	: <i>Habis itu ngelempar saya pake mesin EDC BCA, habis itu saya ditarik sama ayahnya si pelaku.</i>	Assertive
23.	Dwi	: <i>Terus karena HP sama tas saya masih di dalam, akhirnya saya balik lagi ke dalam.</i>	Assertive
24.	Dwi	: <i>Tapi saya malah di lempar lagi pake kursi, akhirnya saya kabur ke belakang ke tempat banyak oven.</i>	Assertive
25.	Dwi	: <i>Di situ saya gak bisa kemana-mana, akhirnya saya di lempar lagi pake barang-barang.</i>	Assertive

26.	Dwi	:	<i>Terus yang endingnya di situ saya di lempar pake loyang kue sampai kepala saya berdarah.</i>	Assertive
27.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jadi berkali-kali itu, Mbak ya?</i>	Assertive
28.	Dwi	:	<i>Dari jam sembilan itu ya.</i>	Assertive
29.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Pertama setelah dia minta Mbak Dwi mengantarkan makanan enggak mau, dia sudah melakukan, nepar.</i>	Assertive
30.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ya, waktu mau pulang dihempas lagi sampai kena, itu kena semua, itu ya?</i>	Assertive
31.	Dwi	:	<i>Kena semua ke badan saya semua.</i>	Assertive
32.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke badan, gak ada yang nolong waktu itu?</i>	Directive
33.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Gak ada temen-temen yang lain gak ada ya di sini ya?</i>	Directive
34.	Dwi	:	<i>Ga ada, saya disitu cuma berdua, sama teman saya satu.</i>	Assertive
35.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, terus sampai akhirnya waktu mengambil handphone itu di lempar, Mbak Dwi tersudut ya?</i>	Assertive
36.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Expressive
37.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Kena kepala itu ya?</i>	Assertive
38.	Dwi	:	<i>Kepala.</i>	Assertive
39.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Itu yang ada bocor di foto itu, ya?</i>	Assertive
40.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Expressive
41.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Gitu ya.</i>	Expressive
42.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Nah, terus apa yang terjadi, Mbak?</i>	Directive
43.	Dwi	:	<i>Terus itu pas udah berdarah, tapi saya nggak tahu kalau disitu udah berdarah tapi saya udah megangin kepala saya begini.</i>	Assertive
44.	Dwi	:	<i>Terus dia mungkin dia udah ngeliat duluan darah, terus gue kabur ke belakang, baru saya bisa kabur keluar toko.</i>	Assertive
45.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Yang dia ngomong apa, "saya kebal hukum" itu sebelum melakukan apa setelah melakukan?</i>	Directive
46.	Dwi	:	<i>Itu, dia kejadian sebelum ini.</i>	Assertive
47.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jadi ada kejadian lain sebelum kejadian itu?</i>	Directive
48.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Expressive
49.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Tanggal berapa kejadian lain?</i>	Directive
50.	Dwi	:	<i>Bulan September.</i>	Assertive
51.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oh, jadi sering dia melakukan hal seperti ini?</i>	Directive
52.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Selain kepada Mbak Dwi ada kepada yang lain juga?</i>	Directive
53.	Dwi	:	<i>Kenapa?</i>	Directive
54.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Selain kepada Mbak Dwi, karyawan lain ada dilakukan juga?</i>	Directive
55.	Dwi	:	<i>Kalau ke karyawan yang lain mungkin dari mulut aja.</i>	Assertive
56.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Omongan, verbal.</i>	Assertive
57.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, tapi yang Mbak Dwi bulan September sudah pernah dilempar juga?</i>	Directive
58.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya, tapi di situ dia lempar saya pakai tempat solasi, itu kena kaki saya.</i>	Assertive
59.	Dwi	:	<i>Kalau terus dia juga lempar saya pakai meja tapi enggak kena.</i>	Assertive

60.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Kena kaki?</i>	Directive
61.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Assertive
62.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke</i>	Assertive
63.	Dwi	:	<i>Kalau terus dia juga lempar saya pakai meja tapi enggak kena.</i>	Assertive
64.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Gak kena.</i>	Assertive
65.	Dwi	:	<i>Nah, yang makanya dia ngomong karena merujuk ke kejadian yang sebelumnya, bahwa dia kebal hukum.</i>	Assertive
66.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, setelah berdarah, Mbak dibawa ke rumah sakit gitu?</i>	Directive
67.	Dwi	:	<i>Ke Klinik.</i>	Assertive
68.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke klinik, Penggilingan situ?</i>	Directive
69.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, lanjut.</i>	Expressive
70.	Dwi	:	<i>Terus habis kejadian itu langsung lapor ke Polsek Cakung.</i>	Assertive
71.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke Polsek Cakung.</i>	Assertive
72.	Dwi	:	<i>Eh, Ramangun dulu, tapi di situ emang gak bisa nangani, karena akhirnya di Cakung juga gak bisa nangani juga.</i>	Assertive
73.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Rawamangun?</i>	Directive
74.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya, tapi di situ emang gak bisa nanganin, karena...</i>	Assertive
75.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, kejadiannya di Cakung.</i>	Assertive
76.	Dwi	:	<i>Akhirnya dirujuk ke Cakung dan di Cakung juga gak bisa nangani juga.</i>	Assertive
77.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Kenapa yang Rawamangun menolak?</i>	Directive
78.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Apa alasannya waktu itu?</i>	Directive
79.	Dwi	:	<i>Mungkin, TKP nya.</i>	Assertive
80.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>TKP, Oke.</i>	Assertive
81.	Dwi	:	<i>Akhirnya saya disuruh ke Polres Jati Negara, Jakarta Timur.</i>	Assertive
82.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke Polres Jakarta Timur di Jati Negara.</i>	Assertive
83.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Itu hari itu juga?</i>	Directive
84.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Hari yang sama?</i>	Directive
85.	Dwi	:	<i>Hari itu juga.</i>	Assertive
86.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jadi hari itu, Mbak, balak balik ke tiga kantor polisi?</i>	Directive
87.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Assertive
88.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Di antar siapa?</i>	Directive
89.	Dwi	:	<i>Eh teman-teman sama keluarga.</i>	Assertive
90.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, 17 Oktober, Mbak, balik balik tiga kator polisi akhirnya diterima di Polres Jakarta Timur di Jati Negara itu ya?</i>	Assertive
91.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke lanjut.</i>	Expressive
92.	Dwi	:	<i>Eh, Paginya langsung fisum. Terus...</i>	Assertive
93.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Fisum.</i>	Assertive
94.	Dwi	:	<i>Ada cerita juga yang tentang pengacaranya.</i>	Assertive
95.	Dwi	:	<i>Saya sempat dikasih, dikirimkan pengacara dari pihak pelaku.</i>	Assertive
96.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oh.</i>	Expressive

97.	Dwi	:	<i>Tapi awalnya saya nggak tahu kalau itu dari pihak pelaku.</i>	Assertive
98.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Heeh.</i>	Expressive
99.	Dwi	:	<i>Dia ngakunya dari LBH, utusan dari Polda.</i>	Assertive
100.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oh, LBH utusan dari Polda?</i>	Directive
101.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya, dia ngakunya.</i>	Assertive
102.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>LBH apa?</i>	Directive
103.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Di sebutin aja mungkin.</i>	Directive
104.	Dwi	:	<i>Kurang tau, dia ngomongnya itu aja.</i>	Assertive
105.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, ngakui dari LBH ya, tapi mbak belakangan tahu itu dari pelaku.</i>	Assertive
106.	Dwi	:	<i>Awalnya ga tau.</i>	Assertive
107.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>	Expressive
108.	Dwi	:	<i>Terus pas pertemuan di Polres pengen BAP.</i>	Assertive
109.	Dwi	:	<i>Disitu dia ngasih kasih tau, kalo dia disuruh sama bos saya.</i>	Assertive
110.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Siapa namanya?</i>	Directive
111.	Dwi	:	<i>Eh... nama pengacaranya?</i>	Directive
112.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Enggak, Pengacaranya siapa namanya?</i>	Directive
113.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Bosnya siapa namanya?</i>	Directive
114.	Dwi	:	<i>Pengacaranya saya ga tau namanya.</i>	Assertive
115.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Iya, nama bos Anda siapa?</i>	Directive
116.	Dwi	:	<i>Linda.</i>	Assertive
117.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oh, Bu Linda, ya?</i>	Directive
118.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Makanya namanya Linda.</i>	Assertive
119.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, lanjut, lanjut.</i>	Expressive
120.	Dwi	:	<i>Akhirnya, mama saya ganti pengacara.</i>	Assertive
121.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Heeh.</i>	Expressive
122.	Dwi	:	<i>Disitu pengacara yang keduanya, kaya nggak...kalau saya tanya tentang gimana kelanjutannya, dia selalu jawab "sedang diproses" "sedang diproses".</i>	Assertive
123.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ke pengacara itu?</i>	Directive
124.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Yang dikirim si itu?</i>	Directive
125.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Atau pengacara lain berikutnya?</i>	Directive
126.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Pengacara kedua?</i>	Directive
127.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Assertive
128.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Sama juga, ngakunya dari Polda?</i>	Assertive
129.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Bukan?</i>	Directive
130.	Dwi	:	<i>Bukan.</i>	Assertive
131.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>	Expressive
132.	Dwi	:	<i>Dia setiap ada info selalu ke rumah dan minta duit.</i>	Assertive
133.	Dwi	:	<i>Mamah saya sampai jual motor.</i>	Assertive
134.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jual motor?</i>	Directive
135.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Assertive
136.	Dwi	:	<i>Motor satu satunya.</i>	Assertive
137.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ya Allah.</i>	Expressive
138.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Lanjut, santai aja.</i>	Expressive
139.	Dwi	:	<i>Habis jual motor itu eh...saya tanya-tanyain.</i>	Assertive
140.	Dwi	:	<i>Itu udah ga ada kontak, ga bisa dihubungin lagi.</i>	Assertive
141.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Pengacaranya ilang?</i>	Directive

142.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Ghosting-lah.</i>	Assertive
143.	Dwi	:	<i>Dia eh...saya dihubungi oleh Pak Jainudin.</i>	Assertive
144.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke, dari tim ini ya?</i>	Directive
145.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Timnya Pak Jon, ya?</i>	Directive
146.	Dwi	:	<i>Iya.</i>	Assertive
147.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>	Expressive
148.	Dwi	:	<i>Saya juga dikasih bantuan oleh Bang Jon eh... kerja di Perusahaan Hi-Five, sama saya juga dikuliahkan di universitas terbaik di Jakarta.</i>	Assertive
149.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Oke.</i>	Expressive
150.	Dwi	:	<i>Sampai lulus.</i>	Assertive
151.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Alhamdulillah, ditolong ya.</i>	Expressive
152.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Jadi, selanjutnya didampingi tim lawyer-nya dari Pak Jon, ya?</i>	Directive
153.	Habiburokhman	:	<i>Sampai akhirnya ditangkap, terus mungkin tim advokasinya.</i>	Assertive

The results that the researcher has obtained from analyzing the conversation between Mr. Habiburokhman and Dwi in the Commission III House of Representatives of Indonesia Meeting video show that there are a total of 153 sentences and 4 types of Speech Acts, namely Directive, Assertive, Expressive, and Commissive. The analysis that has been done is based on the speech acts theory of J.L. Austin and John Searle. These results show that there are several repetitive sentences such as “Oke”, “Iya.”, and “Heeh”. The meaning of the word “Iya” is more than one type, which can be included in Assertive Utterance & Directive Utterance.

TABLE 3. The results of the number of speech act analysis results from the video of the confession of Dwi at house of representatives meeting.

No	SPEECH ACT TYPES	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
1.	Directive Speech Acts	46	30%
2.	Assertive Speech Acts	87	57%
3.	Expressive Speech Acts	18	12%
4.	Commissive Speech Acts	2	1%
TOTAL			153

The table shows the total number for each type of speech acts and the total number of sentences that have been analyzed. The analysis resulted in 153 sentences. The table shows Assertive Speech Acts with the highest number of 87 sentences or 57% of 153 sentences. Directive Speech Acts with 46 sentences or 30% of 153 sentences. Expressive Speech Acts with 18 sentences or 12% of 153 sentences. Commissive Speech Acts with the least amount with only 2 sentences or 1% of 153 sentences. Expressive Speech Acts were performed at major points, quite possibly to emphasize the points being made. By identifying directive and commissive act records at the level of individual instances, it was found out that at some incredibly important turn of the testimony these are used, which might signal an attempt to control the course of the hearing or to shows compliance.

DISCUSSIONS

Examples of Assertives Speech Acts from The Video

Dwi frequently used assertive speech acts to provide information and state facts about the situation at the bakery. These acts served to show the context and background of the issues being discussed. Here are some results from the analysis of assertives speech acts stated by Dwi:

TABLE 4. Assertives speech acts from Dwi’s confession.

No	SENTENCES	
	Indonesian	English
	<i>Si pelaku dari luar masuk ke dalam toko.</i>	The perpetrator from outside entered the bakery.
	<i>Ada hal lain juga, dari sebelum kejadian ini dia juga pernah ngatain saya miskin, babu.</i>	There are other things too, from before this incident he had also called me poor, a babu.
	<i>Di situ saya gak bisa kemana-mana, akhirnya saya di lempar lagi pake barang-barang.</i>	There I could not go anywhere, finally I was thrown again using goods.
	<i>Bulan September.</i>	In September.
	<i>Akhirnya dirujuk ke Cakung dan di Cakung juga gak bisa nangani juga.</i>	Finally, it was referred to Cakung and Cakung couldn't handle it either.

In the table above, it can be concluded that Dwi stated many statements in the form of facts from her experience of this case. This has also been studied by Sulistyowati (2021), about a meeting of board members who use assertive speech acts to convey reports, opinions, or proposals related to public issues. There are also research results from Rahman & Ningsih (2022), explain the use of assertive speech acts between interacting people in this case can be used to convey information to the public. In Dwi's case, Dwi states a report or retell about what she experienced to the public and is certain of the truth because of video evidence and eyewitnesses.

Examples of Directives Speech Act from The Video

The analysis also showed occasions where Mr. Habiburokhman was making a request or making suggestions, possibly to the members of committees involved or other stakeholders of the hearing. Here are some directives speech acts in the video:

TABLE 5. The Directives Speech Acts by Mr. Habiburokhman from The Video.

No	SENTENCES	
	Indonesian	English
1.	<i>Silahkan sampaikan kronologisnya sejak awal, ya.</i>	Please tell us the chronology from the beginning.
2.	<i>Tanggal berapa itu, Mbak Dwi?</i>	What was the date, Ms. Dwi?
3.	<i>Yang dia ngomong apa, "saya kebal hukum" itu sebelum melakukan apa setelah melakukan?</i>	What did he say, "I am invulnerable to the law" before the act or after the act?
4.	<i>Tanggal berapa kejadian lain?</i>	What was the date of the other incident?
5.	<i>Kenapa yang Rawamangun menolak?</i>	Why did Rawamangun refuse?

In the table above, it can be concluded that directives speech acts delivered by Mr. Habiburokhman are in the form of requests such as “Silahkan” or “Please” and sentences with questions that aim to ask for clarity or details of the statements that have been conveyed by Dwi as the interlocutor. These question sentences usually use open-ended questions that use 5W+1H (What, Why, Where, When, Who & How) and yes/no questions. This is also the case in debates, interviews, and other situations that require the speaker to express a request, instruction, or invitation to the listener. There are research results from Heryana (2021) which state that the moderator invites candidates to convey and remind the time limit including directives speech acts. There is also research from Choirudin (2018) that there are examples of directives speech acts, namely people asking the government to improve infrastructure. All of these studies show that inviting and requesting are included in directives speech acts

Examples of Commissive Speech Acts from The Video

There were occurrences of Mr. Habiburokhman making commitments or promises, possibly related to future actions or cooperation with the investigation. Here are the results of the Commissive speech acts analysis of the video:

TABLE 6. The commissive speech acts by Mr. Habiburokhman from the video.

No	SENTENCES	
	Indonesian	English
1.	<i>Tenang aja, Mbak.</i>	Take it easy, miss.
2.	<i>Kita jamin keamanan Anda.</i>	We guarantee your safety.

The sentences in the table above are statements that has a connection where at that time Dwi seemed nervous or difficult to speak so Mr. Habiburokhman calmed her down and guaranteed the safety of Dwi who would explain the events experienced. The second sentence includes a promise related to future actions that will occur during the case investigation process. The promise can be said by all parties, both the officials and the victims or perpetrators of the case. This is as explained by Aljumily (2023) that indictments include promises or commitments conveyed by people related to the criminal acts discussed including in commissives speech acts. There is also research from Weston (2024) which states that promises to commit acts of violence conveyed by someone are speech acts of commissives and include genocide. From the two studies above, it can be concluded that speech act commissives include the delivery of promises and commitments.

Examples of Expressives Speech Acts from The Video

The emotional expressions were noted in Mr. Habiburokhman speech, that she could have employed to warn, show seriousness or even express honesty. Here is the results of the Expressives Speech Acts analysis of the video:

TABLE 7. The expressives speech acts by Mr. Habiburokhman from the video.

No	SENTENCES	
	Indonesian	English
1.	<i>Iya.</i>	Yes.
2.	<i>Gitu ya.</i>	(okay) Like that.
3.	<i>Oke lanjut.</i>	Okay, next.
4.	<i>Heeh.</i>	Yes/Okay.
5.	<i>Oh.</i>	Oh.
6.	<i>Ya Allah.</i>	Oh God.
7.	<i>Alhamdulillah, ditolong ya.</i>	Alhamdulillah (grateful), (you) was helped.

In the table above, it can be seen that the expressive speech acts delivered by Mr. Habiburokhman are mostly in the form of words to respond to the statements made by Dwi. The words used mean that the statement is understood and empathy. There are also words in the form of thanking and mentioning God such as “Alhamdulillah” and “Ya Allah” which can be categorized as expressive speech acts because they are also words to express the feelings felt by the speaker. This is also found in the research of Ambarwati et. al. (2018) which examines the communication of women on Facebook social media pages which also identifies that the word “Alhamdulillah” is included in expressive speech acts. In another study from Zulaeha et. al. (2022) which examined speech acts in a panel of judges in a trial, it resulted that the delivery of empathy, sympathy, and appreciation delivered by the judge was an expressive speech act. From the two studies

above, it can be concluded that the delivery of thanking, praise, empathy, sympathy, appreciation, and words related to conveying the speaker's feelings are included in expressive speech acts.

The method of analysis considered the fact that the speech was given in the session of House of Representatives, which could have affected both the choice of the speech acts and the speakers' manner of their delivery. The context for the confession was highly formalised, mainly because the authorities were present, and this environment along with the legal consequences of what Dwi and Mr. Habiburokhman said entails a very high level of CYA interaction.

RESULT

The results of the speech act analysis of Dwi's confession are useful in understanding the linguistic process that obtains in political and public confession scenarios. This discussion will elaborate on these findings drawing from others research. The research results of the analysis of speech acts in the speech of Dwi and Mr. Habiburokhman in the House of Representatives session are as follows:

1. There are a total of 153 sentences contained in the conversation between Dwi & Mr. Habiburokhman that can be classified into four types of speech acts, namely Assertive, Directives, Commissive, and Expressive.
2. Assertive speech acts are statements in the form of conveying facts that are certainly true and telling experiences that really happened by the speaker.
3. Directives speech acts are statements in the form of requests, invitations, and questions asking for clarity submitted to the listener by the speaker, for example using the word "Please".
4. Commissive speech acts are statements in the form of promises and committies conveyed by speakers to their interlocutors and will be related to future acts, for example the use of the word "Guarantee".
5. Expressive speech acts are statements of understanding, praise, empathy, sympathy, thanking, appreciation, and other words used by speakers to convey their feelings.
6. This research can strengthen the explanation of the classification of types of speech acts in political communication situations that have been accompanied by other studies related to the discussion.

Analyzing the speech acts in Dwi's confession is useful to give an appreciation of the literature on speech acts and political talk and public confession. It aims to illustrate language in these settings and informs the reader about the considerations of their content. The results have the ways that language exists and operates in political contexts and lays out the groundwork for future research in this area.

CONCLUSION

The data of this study was Dwi's confession made during the House of Representatives meeting, where this research aimed at determining the use of speech acts in political discourse. During the course of this work, people realized that there are four principal categories of speech acts, namely assertive, directives, expressive, and commissive. The majority were assertive in nature saying that provisory information, facts or a setting needed to be presented. Emotional dimension was expressed through the intention, and commissive acts were utilized sparingly due to the legal nature of the conversations.

Several limitations should be taken into account. First, generalization of the conclusions of this study is limited due to its focus on one case of political disinformation.

As much as the qualitative approach is rich in details, it is a disadvantageous way of measuring the district extent of specific speech acts. Further, it must also be noted that the criteria for putting an utterance in one category or the other may be interpreted biasing due to the inherently ambiguous nature of many speech acts.

The future research should employ cross cultural or cross sectional designs to increase validity in public recognition of what has been discussed. Qualitative methods may locate more general patterns of speech acts while Digital communication research may show us more possibilities Nonverbal communication studies may also provide avenues. An analysis of ethical issues and power relations in political discourse will enrich existing knowledge of the communication process in critical and significant settings. This research provides base on which further studies on language as performance in politics will be built.

REFERENCES

- Ambarwati, R., et.al. (2018). Expressive speech acts of women's communication on Facebook. In *International Conference on Language Phenomena in Multimodal Communication (KLUA 2018)* (pp. 106-109). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/klua-18.2018.15>
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How To Do Things with Words*. Harvard University Press. [https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=B3ILEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Austin,+J.+L.+\(1962\).+How+to+Do+Things+with+Words.+Oxford:+Clarendon+Press.&ots=ikbZZCdwy8&sig=OfHPEK4dg_e9gyitE1IIIahlhk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=B3ILEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Austin,+J.+L.+(1962).+How+to+Do+Things+with+Words.+Oxford:+Clarendon+Press.&ots=ikbZZCdwy8&sig=OfHPEK4dg_e9gyitE1IIIahlhk&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Ballard, W. L. & M. A. K. Halliday (1980). Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. London: Edward Arnold, 1978. Pp. 256. *Language in Society*, 9(1), 84–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s004740450000782x>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (No. 4). Cambridge University Press, <http://www.cambridge.org>
- Choirudin, L. A. (2018). Tindak Tutur Direktif Dalam Rubrik “Suara Rakyat” Di Surat Kabar Harian Kedaulatan Rakyat. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 7(3), 374-387. <https://journal.student.uny.ac.id/bsi/article/view/11474>
- Dylgjeri, A. (2017). Analysis Of Speech Acts in Political Speeches. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.344518>
- Evizaria. (2024). Pragmatic Analysis of Political Discourse: A Case Study of Presidential Debates. *Social Studies & Humanities Journal (SOSHUM)*, 1(1), 78-89 <https://doi.org/10.62207>
- Galyashina, E. I. (2016). Forensic Linguistics in Legal Proceedings. *Lex Russica*, 9 (118), 136-145. https://www.academia.edu/99922478/Forensic_Linguistics_In_Legal_Proceedings
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays In Face-To-Face Behavior*. Routledge, 280. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203788387>
- Hashim, S. S. M. (2015). Speech acts in political speeches. *Journal of Modern Education Review*, 5(7), 699–706. [https://doi.org/10.15341/jmer\(2155-7993\)/07.05.2015/008](https://doi.org/10.15341/jmer(2155-7993)/07.05.2015/008)
- Heryana, N. (2021). Kesantunan Tindak Tutur Direktif Moderator Dalam Debat Final Pilpres Tahun 2019. *Jurnal Metamorfosa*, 9(2), 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.46244/metamorfosa.v9i2.1395>
- Maíz-Arévalo, C. (2017). Expressive Speech Acts in Educational e-chats. *Pragmática Sociocultural / Sociocultural Pragmatics*, 5(2), 151–178. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soprag-2017-0016>
- Moreland-Russell, S., et. al. (2015). “Hearing from All Sides” How Legislative Testimony Influences State Level Policy-Makers in the United States. *SSRN*

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2561966

- Rahman, F., & Ningsih, R. (2022). Kesantunan Tindak Tutur Asertif Memberitahukan Dalam Acara Catatan Demokrasi Manuver Giring di Depan Jokowi Di Tv One. *Kredo Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 6(1), 128–149. <https://doi.org/10.24176/kredo.v6i1.8467>
- Rakaj, D. (2022). The Speech Act of Promising in Political Speeches: A Case Study of Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(5), 908–915. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1305.02>
- Rizzelli, L., Kassin, S., & Gales, T. (2021). Language of Criminal Confessions. *The Wrongful Conviction Law Review*, 2(3), 205–225. <https://doi.org/10.29173/wclawr58>
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: *Speech Acts*. (2020, September 24). <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts/>
- Sulistiyowati, R. I. (2021). Kesantunan Tindak Tutur Asertif dan Komisif dalam Etika Politik Sidang Anggota Dewan. *Spektrum*, 17(2), 72-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31942/spektrum.v17i2.4362>
- Toan, L. N. (2024). The Linguistic Analysis of Indictments in English Through Speech Acts And Evaluation Frameworks. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(4), 190. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n4p190>
- Toisuta, E. G., & Aritonang, P. (2024). An Analysis of Directive Speech Acts and Their Felicity Conditions in Jokowi's G20 Session I Speech. *MATAI: International Journal of Language Education*, 5(1), 100-112 <https://ojs3.unpatti.ac.id/index.php/matail>
- Weston, D. (2024). Genocidal Speech and Speech Act Theory. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale De Sémiotique Juridique*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-024-10209-0>
- Zulaeha, I., et. al. (2022). The Humanist Expressive Speech acts of the Judicial panel at the State Court. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research/Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. 574 <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211125.091>