

DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACT SEEN ON *FAMILY 2.0* DRAMA SCRIPT WRITTEN BY WALTER WYKES

Evi Jovita Putri*

English Literature Department, National University

Received on 1 April 2018 / Approved 16 April 2018

ABSTRACT

The research entitled Directive Speech Act Seen on Family 2.0 Drama Script Written by Walter Wykes purposes to describe and uncover the types of form and intended meaning of directive speech act on that drama script. This descriptive research uses pragmatic approach and theory. The collecting and analysing data are focused on the using of declarative, imperative, and interrogative sentences in the text of drama. The forms of those sentences will be analysed to find out the types of form of directive speech act, while the context of those sentences will be used to analyze the intended meaning of directive speech act uttered by speakers. The results of the research are found that, first, there are two types of the form of directive speech acts, direct directive speech acts and indirect directive speech acts. Direct directive speech acts are represented by imperative sentence without subject; imperative sentence with let; and negative imperative sentence. Meanwhile the indirect directive speech acts are represented by declarative sentence statement; declarative sentence if clause; negative declarative sentences; and interrogative sentences. Second, the intended meanings seen on drama script of Family 2.0 are command, prohibition, request, treat, and persuasion. It can be concluded that, the most frequent intended meaning appeared in directive speech acts on this script is command by the use of imperative forms. Then, the declarative and interrogative forms are used to request something by adults characters; in contrast the kids characters use them to command and prohibit the hearer.

Keywords: family 2.0, pragmatic, speech act, directive, form and intended meaning

ABSTRAK

Penelitian yang berjudul *Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Naskah Drama Family 2.0 Karya Walter Wykes* bertujuan untuk menemukan bentuk-bentuk penggunaan dari tindak tutur direktif dalam naskah drama Family 2.0 serta mencari makna yang dimaksud penutur dibalik penggunaan tindak tutur direktif tersebut. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian deskriptif kualitatif yang menggunakan pendekatan pragmatik. Pengumpulan data diperoleh melalui teknik simak dimana peneliti hanya mendapatkan data melalui tuturan tertulis yang ada dalam teks drama, kemudian didukung oleh video pementasan drama tersebut sebagai visualisasi dari konteks dan situasi tuturan. Data penelitian meliputi kalimat-kalimat yang dituturkan para tokoh. Analisis bentuk tindak tutur direktif dilakukan dengan cara menganalisis struktur kalimat penutur kepada mitra tutur, sedangkan analisis makna tindak tutur direktif diungkapkan dengan konteks kalimat atau aspek-aspek situasi tuturan. Adapun hasil penelitian ini adalah, pertama, bentuk tindak tutur direktif yang ditemukan dalam naskah drama ini ada dua yaitu tindak tutur direktif langsung dan tidak langsung. Bentuk tindak tutur direktif langsung diwujudkan melalui kalimat imperatif tanpa subjek; kalimat imperatif dengan let; kalimat imperatif negatif, sedangkan bentuk tindak tutur direktif tidak langsung diwujudkan melalui kalimat deklaratif pernyataan; kalimat deklaratif pengandaian; kalimat deklaratif negatif; dan kalimat interogatif tipe yes/no question. Kedua, makna tindak tutur direktif dalam naskah drama ini ada lima yaitu makna perintah, larangan, permintaan, bujukan, dan ancaman. Berkaitan dengan penelitian ini, dapat disimpulkan bahwa makna yang paling dominan digunakan penutur adalah perintah yang disampaikan dalam bentuk kalimat imperatif. Kemudian bentuk deklaratif dan interogatif digunakan oleh penutur dewasa untuk menyatakan makna permintaan, sedangkan kedua bentuk tersebut biasanya digunakan oleh penutur anak-anak untuk menyatakan suatu perintah kepada mitra tutur.

Kata Kunci: Family 2.0, pragmatik, tindak tutur direktif, bentuk dan makna

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

According to Yule (1996), directives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. It aims to produce an effect in the form of the action taken by the addressees. The previous studies revealing the function of directive speech acts in English has been conducted by some researchers; however, only few of the studies conducted using drama scripts as source materials. Such researches are commonly conducted by using screenplays, novels, or short stories as the source materials in which the writer aims to conduct an analysis of directive speech acts in a drama script. One of the previous studies was conducted by Wijana (2008). He used a literary work in the form of short story entitled "Harga Seorang Perempuan" as the data source. The research reveals that the use of language uttered by the characters in a literary works enhances their characterisation. He analysed the directive speech acts of the female characters in the story and learn that the females might use imperative, declarative, and interrogative speech acts to perform the directive speech acts. The different forms of directive speech acts uttered by the female characters therefore reflect their characterisation.

Based on the previous study, the writer believes that further research about the use of language in literary works is needed, especially in the forms of drama scripts. A drama or play refers to a literary works written for performance which consists of dialogues. A drama script provides a large number of data in the use of language for a research analysis. The *Family 2.0* by Walter Wykes is one of the drama scripts that can be featured to conduct the research. This short drama consists of dialogues in which put the addressees to perform actions uttered by speakers. The writer finds some imperative sentences in the drama script in which make the addressee perform actions uttered by the speaker, even declarative and interrogative sentences are functioned as orders to the addressee. The sentences are uttered by different characters

like adults and kids in which the directives speech acts are also performed by different individuals.

Furthermore, this conducted research is also based on the research by Nadar back in 2006 entitled "Penolakan dalam Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia: Kajian Pragmatik tentang Realisasi Strategi Kesopanan Berbahasa". The previous study focuses on the language used by speakers functioned as refusals in both Indonesian and English. In this situation, Nadar learns that the forms of directive speech acts are functioned as refusals in English language. The contextual description based on the study is adopted as a reference to analyse the directive speech acts in the drama script of *Family 2.0* by Walter Wykes because it has the similar setting of Western culture.

Based on the previous study, this research aims to gain a deep understanding of two things, first is to find the forms of directive speech acts in the drama script of *Family 2.0* by Walter Wykes and second is to analyse the intended meanings behind those forms. It is mentioned that although many studies about the function of directive speech acts have been conducted, yet the writer believes that using a drama script as the source of data, especially the drama of *Family 2.0* by Walter Wykes, has never been done before. This research hopefully will be a reference to show that the use of directive speech acts in English can also be found in other literary works like drama scripts and also to enrich the knowledge in the directive speech acts in English and other related studies.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In order to support this research, the writer employed the pragmatic approach and other theories related to directive speech acts, sentence structures, and intended meanings. According to Yule (1996, p. 53), directives speech acts used to get someone else to do something. They express what the speakers want. Thus, every sentence uttered by speakers which aimed to produce an effect in the forms

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com

of actions taken by the addressees in the drama script of *Family 2.0* by Walter Wykes is classified as directive speech acts either in the forms of declarative, imperative, or interrogative utterances. The directive speech act is distinguished into direct and indirect speech act. Wijana and Rohmadi (2009, p. 8) states that direct speech act is when there is a direct relationship between the function of a speech act and its structural form, indirect speech act is when there is no direct relationship between the function of a speech act and its structural form but rather indirect one.

Nadar (2009, p. 75) states that directive sentence in English consists of at least a subject and a verb. Moreover, Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1973, pp. 26-29) explain that the subject of a sentence in English could be a noun, a pronoun, a *gerund* (a verb ending in *-ing*), an infinitive (a verb preceded by *to*), a noun phrase and a noun clause. A predicate could be a main verb like *walk, sleep*; an auxiliary verb like *do, have, be*; a modal like *can, could, may, will*; a semi-modal like *have to, have got to, be about to*. Furthermore, Downing and Locke (1992, p. 171) states that declarative sentences end in a falling intonation; Ramlan (2005, p. 26) adds that a declarative sentence is started with a capital letter, ended with full stop, and no interrogative meaning, suggestion, command, and prohibition are included; it is generally asking for responds from the addressees.

An imperative sentence is used to get someone else to do something. Nadar (2009, p. 90) believed that imperative sentences are divided into five different forms; they are a sentence without a subject, a sentence with a subject, a sentence begins with *let*, a negative form, and a persuasive form. Furthermore, according to Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1973, pp. 200-202), an imperative sentence can appear with only a base verb. A politeness marker like *please* may be added into the form to soften a sentence like command in imperatives. An imperative sentence with a subject has similar structure with the declarative, yet they can be distinguished by use of intonation. In this

situation, an imperative sentence ends in rising intonation.

An interrogative sentence is used to ask something in the form of question to the addressees. An interrogative sentence generally begins with a question word like *yes/no question* or *w/h question*. In Nadar (2009, p. 85), it is explained that there are three types of interrogatives in English; those which a speaker demands a *yes* or *no* as answer, an information, and choices or other possible answers. A *yes/no question* or an interrogative which demands a *yes* or *no* for an answer begins with an auxiliary verb, followed by a subject. An interrogative *w/h question* used *what, who, where, when, whose, which, whom, and how* in the beginning of the sentence, followed an auxiliary verb.

The main factor to determine the meaning of directive speech acts is through the context. Context includes the numerous elements that surround the speech act. Leech (1993, as cited in Wijana, 2003) believes that there are five elements of speech situation; they are addressers and addressees, context of an utterance, goals, of an utterance, utterance as a form of act or activity, utterance as a product of a verbal act. Thus, this research pays a lot of attention in the elements of speech situation of the directive speech acts found in the data in order to find the sense or intended meaning from the speakers.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The qualitative approach is used in this research. The description is based on the forms and context of the utterances in the drama script that later will be elaborated by the interpretation and understanding of the writer. This research adopts the following methods to collect and analyse the data:

Collecting the Data

'*Simak*' method or observation method is used to collect the data where the writer observes the used of written language in the drama script of *Family 2.0* by Walter Wykes. The technique used in this research is '*simak bebas libat cakap*' technique. The writer is not

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com

participated or involved in the nature of the data but only as an observer (Sudaryanto, 1988, as cited in Kesuma, 2007, p. 44). Another theory used in this research is 'catat' or note-taking technique. The writer takes note and gathers all directive sentences uttered by the characters in the drama script. To gain more understanding towards the context of the speech acts, the writer also watches the live action of the drama.

Analysing the Data

Meanwhile, descriptive technique is used to analyse the data in this research by explaining various aspects of language phenomenon in the data. The writer analyses the different forms and functions of declarative speech acts. The data will be divided into direct and indirect speech act. When the data reveal that the utterances spoken by a speaker directly accordance with the speaker's intention, they will be classified as direct speech act; however, when they are not, they will be classified as indirect speech act. Next, the context surrounded the utterances in both direct and indirect speech acts will also be analyzed to find the speaker's intended meaning. The context depends on the important elements that surround the utterances; they are addressers and addressees, context of an utterance, goals, of an utterance, utterance as a form of act or activity, utterance as a product of a verbal act. Moreover, the previous studies related to the forms and functions of directive speech acts in English from different sources of data will also support the analysis to determine the context of directive speech acts found in the drama script alongside with the definitions in *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* which helps to describe different terms in English in different situations.

DISCUSSION

There are two forms of directive speech acts found in the *Family 2.0* drama script by Walter Wykes and they also have different meanings. The first form is direct directive speech acts uttered by using

imperative sentences; the second is indirect directive speech acts uttered by using declarative and interrogative sentences. Furthermore, the meanings of the directive speech acts found in the script are to command, prohibit, request, persuade, and threaten. The writer gives further explanation with some examples in the following discussion about the forms and functions of directive speech acts found in the *Family 2.0* drama script by Walter Wykes.

The most common form of directive speech acts is the use of imperative sentences. It is classified as directive speech acts because it is associated with their general function which is used to make someone to do something. Imperative sentences have different structures like those with a subject, begin with *let*, and negative forms. It is mentioned that that imperative sentences are divided into five different forms; they are a sentence without a subject, a sentence with a subject, a sentence begins with *let*, a negative form, and a persuasive form.

The intended meanings of direct directive speech acts are to command, prohibit, and request. The dominant meaning intended by the speakers by using imperative sentences in the script is to command something to someone.

One of the examples of imperative sentence is shown in data (8), *Wait! Give me your key* 'Tunggu! Berikan kuncimu.' The sentence appears with no subject and begin with a basic verb *give*, 'berikan' followed by indirect object *me* 'saya'. Based on the context, the speaker intends to command the addressee. The intended meaning to command someone is shown by different levels of authority between the wife and husband. The wife is more dominant than the husband in their relationship. Moreover, the husband realises that he is not an ideal figure of both husband and father in the family that makes his position even difficult in that moment. In the scene, the wife has finally found a new gentleman and he is good enough to be the new husband. The wife immediately gets her former spouse out of the house without hesitation because she just has no more reasons to keep him as her

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com

husband. She wants her former husband to get out of the house without bringing anything, not even the family car which the husband usually drives to work. The wife will not give the car to her former husband. Thus, the speaker's intended meaning is classified as command because the speaker doesn't use any politeness marker; in fact, the speaker shows a dominant authority toward the addressee. The addressee has no choice other than to follow the instruction. The explanation is supported by Nadar (2006) who believes that commands are shown in different levels of authority between the speaker and addressee. The speaker is described to have more dominant authority towards the addressee and it causes the speaker's intended meaning becomes something that has to be done by the addressee. The addressee has no choice other than to follow the instruction commanded by the speaker.

Another example of imperative sentence is shown in data (13), *just let me stay!* 'biarkan aku di sini'. This imperative sentence appears with no subject, but begins with the word *let* and followed by the first singular person *me* and the verb *stay* 'tinggal'. The structure of the sentence is in the form of imperative. Based on the context, it is uttered by a speaker who is no longer has power and authority in a relationship. The husband has failed to carry out his duty to make and keep his family happy. In this situation, the wife with a high level of authority has power to get the husband out of the house without anything to bring. Thus, the husband as the addressee begs his wife as the speaker to let him stay in the house although he knows that the wife has already had a new husband. The addressee with a lower level of power and authority asks the speaker to give let him stay. The use of *let* gives more evidence of the lack of authority from the addressee because he begs the speaker's permission to stay in the house. Thus, the intended meaning of the imperative sentence is to request.

It is mentioned that the form of directive speech acts in both direct and indirect is uttered by using imperative sentence and it intends to command someone. Moreover, such

intended meaning is commonly uttered by an adult with lack of power and authority. There is no direct speech act uttered by the kid characters in the script, means that it is used by adult characters only. The writer also finds that imperative sentences uttered by the adult characters in the script followed by politeness markers tend to weaken the intended meaning of the directive speech acts like the intended meaning of asking favours.

The use of declarative sentences in the form of indirect directive speech acts is the second most common form used in the drama script of *Family 2.0* by Walter Wykes. Based on the sentence structure, it is generally functioned to make a statement or to declare something to the addressee. However, when this type of sentence is used to make someone to do something, the function will change into the indirect directive speech acts. The declarative speech acts found in the script are in the forms of conditional sentence and negative declarative statement. The writer also finds that the meanings of directive speech acts uttered by using declarative sentences have intended meanings to request, to persuade someone, to threaten someone, to command someone to do something, and to prohibit someone from doing something. Declarative sentences are commonly used by the characters of kids in the script to command and prohibit in which generally uttered by the adults. On the other hand, the adult characters tend to use declarative sentences to request and persuade someone to do something. The most dominant meaning in the use of declarative sentence found in the script is to request.

An example of declarative sentence is found in data (26), *We have to go NOW!*, 'kita harus pergi SEKARANG!'. Based on the form of the sentence, it is clearly a declarative sentence. The sentence begins with a capital letter for the pronoun *We* 'kita' as the subject that appears in the beginning of the sentence, then it is followed by a modal *have to* 'harus' and a verb *go* 'pergi', and then followed by an adverb of time *NOW* 'sekarang'. Thus, the structure of the sentence is in the form of declarative sentence.

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com

According to Nadar (2009, p. 75) directive sentence in English consists of at least a subject and a verb in the beginning of the sentence and then followed by a verb. The intended meaning of the sentence in data (26) is to command. Based on the context, the sentence is uttered by a son to his new father. The father has promised to his new son to bring him to a baseball match. However, when it is the time to go to the match, the father hasn't been ready just yet. The son is furious because his new father can't keep his promise. The son has to go because he has boasted about the match and he doesn't want to be made fun of by his friends if he misses it. Thus, the son commands his new father to take him there. If the new father does not follow the instruction, he will not be able to be the new father. The son will tell his mother that this new guy is not good enough to be the new father for the family. Afraid of being kicked out from the new house by his new family, the new father has no choice other than to follow the instruction commanded by his new son. In this situation, the new father as the addressee has lack of power and authority than the speaker that he has no choice but to obey the command something to someone.

Another example of declarative sentence as indirect directive speech acts is also found in data (19). The sentence *I'll take you to the Big game* 'Saya akan membawamu ke pertandingan baseball' is a declarative sentence. The sentence begins with a capital letter for the pronoun *I* 'kita' as the subject that appears in the beginning of the sentence, then it is followed by a modal *will* 'akan' and a verb *take* 'bawa', and then followed by an object *you* 'kamu' then a propositional phrase *to the big game* 'ke laga'. Thus, the structure of the sentence is in the form of declarative sentence. The intended meaning of the sentence in data (26) is to persuade. The context describes that the sentence is uttered by an adult male in which mentioned in the script as the new father of the family. The utterance is given to his new (step) when they meet for the first time. To win the heart of his new son as the addressee, the new father tries to persuade him with his favourite things. By

doing so, the addressee will accept and willingly take the speaker as his new father. Based on the context, it is clear that the intended meaning of the sentence is to persuade someone to do something. According to Nadar (2006), the ability to persuade someone builds when the speaker reduced his/her power to the addressee in order to win over situation and get the addressee to accept and do anything the speaker wants. Thus, the intended meaning of the sentence is to persuade someone.

Interrogative sentence is generally used to ask someone a question or request for information. In this research, interrogative sentence is classified into indirect directive speech act because the general function changes and it is used to to make the addressee do what the speaker wants. Thus, there is no direct relationship between the function of the sentence with its structural form and it makes the sentence classified as the indirect directive speech act.

In this situation, the type of sentence found in the script is *Yes/No Question* using the question words *could* and *can*. The intended meanings of interrogative sentences found in the script are to command and request, yet the most dominant meaning is commands. The intended meaning of command frequently appears because the interrogative sentences are uttered when the speakers have more power and authority than addressees. Although the sentence is uttered indirectly and seems to be polite, the speakers will not take *no* for answer and the addressee leaves with no choice other than to obey the speaker's commands. Thus, the intended meaning of the sentence tends to be more a command than a request.

One example in the use of interrogative sentence is found in data (16) as follows, *could you take care of the dog?* 'bisakah kamu menjaga anjing itu?'. The structure of the sentence appears with a question word *could* 'bisakah' in the beginning of the sentence and followed by *you* 'kamu' as the subject, *take care* 'menjaga' as the verb, then it is ended with a question mark (?). According to Nadar (2009), the interrogative

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com

sentence which requires *yes* or *no* or *yes/no question* appears with an auxiliary verb in the beginning of the sentence and followed by a subject, like *does, do, are, may, can, could, should, would*, etc. Thus, the structure of the sentence in data (16) is in the form of an interrogative sentence. Based on the context, the sentence is uttered by the wife to her new husband. In this situation, the new husband is eager to have sex with the wife yet the wife wants him to taking care of the household first, like taking care of the dog that keeps barking at that moment. Although the wife asks the new husband with an interrogative sentence, she will take *no* for answer because she won't accept him as the new husband let alone have sex with him unless he does exactly what she wants. In this stage, the wife has more power and authority than the new husband and he has to obey her instruction. In other words, the interrogative sentence has an intended meaning to command someone.

The next example found in the data (15) as follows, *Can we have sex now?* 'bisakah kita bercinta sekarang?'. The structure of the sentence appears with a question word *can* 'bisakah' in the beginning of the sentence and followed by *we* 'kita' as the subject, *have* as the verb, then it is ended with a question mark (?). Based on the context, the sentence isn't supposed to use for asking question or request information instead it is uttered to ask the addressee to do what the speaker wants. The speaker is the new husband and the addressee is the wife. In this situation, the speaker has lack of power and authority than the addressee because she has more power in the household. She has been the one in charge and the new husband has to obey the wife because not only he obviously needs her but he also doesn't want to lose everything he has now. The speaker decides to be more powerless in front of the addressee to show more politeness and imply that he willingly obeys his new wife. Thus, the intended meaning of the speaker is a request. Nadar (2006) states that a request is highly depends on the politeness of the utterance in order to make the addressee willingly does what the speaker wants. In text, the intended meaning a requests appears with a

basic verb, an auxiliary verb, a modal verb, a conditional sentence, even a command, and politeness markers are generally added into the sentence.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The research of the directive speech acts found in *Family 2.0* drama script by Walter Wykes comes to several conclusions; first, the most dominant form of directive speech act uttered by the speakers to the addressees is in direct sentences in the form of imperatives, next is indirect sentences in the forms of declaratives and interrogatives. Second, the imperatives uttered by the speakers are the sentences which appear without subjects; begin with *let*; and in negative forms, the declaratives appear in the forms of statements, negative sentences, and conditional sentences. The interrogatives uttered by the speakers appear in the form of *yes/no questions*. Third, there are five the intended meanings of directive speech acts found in the script, they are: command, prohibition, request, persuasion, and threat. The intended meaning of command, prohibition, and request are found in the sentences in the forms of direct directive speech acts; the intended meaning of request, persuasion, threat, command, and prohibition are found in the sentences in the forms of indirect directive speech acts in declaratives; the intended meaning of command and prohibition found in he forms of indirect directive speech acts in interrogatives.

Related to the research, the drama script tends to have a lot of direct directive speech acts in the form of imperatives because direct speech act is much easier to understand and fast enough to tell. The frequent intended meanings appear in the direct speech are command and prohibition. On the other hand, the directive speech act in the forms of declaratives and interrogatives are commonly used to request something by the adult characters; in contrast, the kid characters use the declarative and interrogative sentences to command and prohibit. However, there are only a few findings in the use of indirect

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com

directive speech act in declaratives and interrogatives in which quite difficult to determine if there is any influence on the ages of the characters of the drama with the declarative speech acts appeared in the script. In this research, it reveals that the drama script of *Family 2.0* provides different types of declarative speech acts that appear in both direct and indirect speech act in use of imperatives, declaratives, and interrogatives; yet again, there script has lack of directives intended meaning in the use of directive speech act. In fact, the most frequent intended meaning implied by the characters in the *Family 2.0* drama script is command.

The writer realises that this research needs corrections here and there, and hopefully it will be more elaborated by future researchers. Based on this research, it is revealed that short drama scripts don't provide enough source of data for various types of intended meaning in directive speech acts. In this case, the writer assumed that long drama scripts or screenplays will provided more data of the forms and intended meaning in directive speech acts. Moreover, more researches related to the study of directive speech acts need to be more developed by including the study of Sociolinguistics, hopefully it will be helpful to find out other elements that influence the use of language of different individuals. Thus, the future studies will be able to describe the influence of power of different individuals with different background, especially in drama scripts.

REFERENCES

- Downing, A., & Locke, P. (1992). *A university course in English grammar*. United Kingdom: Prentice Hall International.
- Kesuma, T. M. J. (2007). *Pengantar (Metode) penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Carasvatibooks.
- Nadar, F.X. (2006). *Penolakan dalam bahasa Inggris dan bahasa Indonesia (Kajian pragmatik tentang realisasi strategi kesantunan berbahasa)* (doctoral thesis). Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Nadar, F.X. (2009). *Pragmatik dan penelitian pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. N., & Svartvik, J. (1973). *A grammar of contemporary English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Ramlan. (2005). *Sintaksis*. Yogyakarta: C.V. Karyono.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (2003). *KARTUN: Studi tentang permainan bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Ombak.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (2008). Tindak tutur dan perwarakan dalam cerpen "Harga seorang perempuan" karya Oka Rusmini. *SINTESIS*, 6(1), 50-65.
- Wijana, I. D. P., & Rohmadi, M. (2009). *Analisis wacana pragmatik: Kajian teori dan analisis*. Yogyakarta: Yuma Pusaka.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: evijovitaputri@gmail.com