ESTEEM
Journal of English Study Programme
E-ISSN: 2622-2213
P-ISSN: 2622-9323

DIRECTIVE ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS PRODUCED BY MABEL IN "HOPPERS" MOVIE: A SPEECH ACT ANALYSIS

Jessica Angeline Sayuti[1*], Windy[2]
[1,2]Universitas Widya Dharma Pontianak, Indonesia
E-mail: [1,2]jessicangelines.uwdp@gmail.com

Accepted:

16 November 2026

Published:

18 November 2026

Corresponding Author:

Jessica Angeline Sayuti

Email Corresponding:

jessicangelines.uwdp@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify the types of directive illocutionary acts produced by Mabel in *Hoppers* and examine how they are interpreted based on her utterances and their surrounding contexts. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach, the study used Mabel's utterances obtained from the movie's English subtitles and verified them by examining the corresponding scenes. The data were categorized into commands, orders, requests, and suggestions based on Yule's classification of directive speech acts. Furthermore, direct and indirect forms were examined by considering the relationship between grammatical structures and their intended communicative functions. The analysis identified 71 directive illocutionary acts, consisting of 39 commands (54.9%), 18 requests (25.4%), 9 suggestions (12.7%), and 5 orders (7.0%). Commands emerged as the most frequent type, indicating that Mabel frequently used directive expressions in urgent situations where immediate responses or actions from other characters were needed. These findings contribute to the study of pragmatics and speech-act pedagogy by illustrating how directive meanings are conveyed and interpreted through linguistic forms, speaker intentions, relationships among participants, and situational contexts. Unlike previous studies that examined directive speech acts produced by multiple characters, this research concentrates on a single main character and relates the distribution of directive types to their direct and indirect realizations throughout her interactions.

Keywords: Directive Illocutionary Acts, Speech Act, Mabel, Pragmatics, Hoppers

1. INTRODUCTION

A speech act refers to an action performed through language when a speaker produces an utterance in a particular communicative situation. Therefore, communication involves more than understanding the literal meaning of words, as listeners also need to recognize the intentions and purposes underlying the speaker's expressions (Austin, 1962; Yule, 2010). Searle (1969) explained that speech acts are closely related to the functions of language in communication, since utterances can be used to perform different actions depending on the speaker's intention. Similarly, Bach and Harnish (1979) emphasized the relationship between linguistic expressions and the communicative intentions conveyed by speakers. In pragmatics, understanding an utterance consequently requires attention to its linguistic form, intended meaning, and communicative context (Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996).

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

This study specifically examines directive illocutionary acts because they represent an important category of speech acts commonly found in everyday communication. According to Yule (1996, 2010), directives are utterances through which speakers attempt to get listeners to perform particular actions. They may appear in various forms, including commands, orders, requests, and suggestions. However, the intended function of a directive does not always correspond directly to its grammatical structure. For example, the expression "Close the window" functions as a direct command, whereas "Could you close the window, please?" conveys a request through an interrogative structure. Although the latter is grammatically expressed as a question, its primary communicative purpose is to encourage the listener to perform an action rather than simply provide a yes-or-no answer. Yule (2010) distinguished direct speech acts, in which grammatical structure corresponds to communicative function, from indirect speech acts, in which the intended function differs from the sentence structure. This distinction demonstrates that identifying directive illocutionary acts requires an understanding of the relationship between linguistic forms and speakers' intended meanings (Searle, 1979; Huang, 2014).

The interpretation of directive utterances is also influenced by the circumstances in which communication takes place. Speakers may select different expressions depending on their relationships with listeners, the purpose of the interaction, and the social situations involved. Brown and Levinson (1987) explained that politeness plays an important role in how speakers formulate requests and other potentially face-threatening expressions. Similarly, Ervin-Tripp (1976) demonstrated that directive forms vary according to social relationships and interactional circumstances. Cutting (2002) also emphasized the importance of contextual information in interpreting meaning beyond individual words and grammatical structures. Therefore, analyzing directive illocutionary acts involves examining not only what speakers say but also why particular expressions are used and how their intended meanings are understood within specific situations.

The researcher selected this topic because recognizing the intended functions of utterances is essential for achieving effective communication and preventing misunderstandings. Although listeners may understand the vocabulary and grammatical structures used by speakers, they may not always identify whether an utterance functions as a command, order, request, or suggestion. This issue becomes particularly important when speakers communicate indirectly or use expressions that appear different from their actual intentions. As Thomas (1995) explained, meaning in interaction cannot be separated from the context in which an utterance occurs. Furthermore, Grundy (2008) highlighted the importance of interpreting language through its use in particular communicative situations. For this reason, examining directive illocutionary acts can provide a better understanding of how speakers use language to influence the actions of others through different linguistic expressions.

Movies provide useful materials for investigating speech acts because their dialogues represent various forms of interaction among characters. Bordwell and Thompson (2002) described film as an art form that communicates ideas and experiences through different cinematic elements. Within movie dialogues, characters use language to express intentions, establish relationships, respond to conflicts, persuade others, and influence the development of the storyline. These interactions provide opportunities to examine how speech acts operate in different communicative circumstances. Previous studies have demonstrated the relevance of movie dialogues as sources of pragmatic analysis. For instance, Wiliastini et al. (2021) examined directive illocutionary acts in *Moana*, while Febriola et al. (2022) investigated directive acts produced by characters in *Cruella*. More recent studies have explored directive speech acts in *Spider-Man: No Way Home* (Insyra & Supri, 2024), *Pixels* (Singal & Ambalegin, 2024), and *Inside Out 2* (Arum, 2025). Other investigations have also examined directive expressions in *Thunderbolts* (Febriany & Afriana, 2025), *A Man Called Otto* (Pramudita et al., 2025), and *Jumanji: The Next Level* (Zabella et al., 2025). These

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

studies demonstrate that movie conversations offer relevant data for identifying different types and functions of directive illocutionary acts.

The data source for this research is *Hoppers*, an animated science-fiction comedy film featuring Mabel, a university student who has a strong interest in animals and is determined to protect their natural habitat. In the story, she transfers her consciousness into a robotic beaver to interact with animals and take action to protect the forest. The movie was selected because its dialogues contain various communicative situations in which directive expressions are used to influence other characters' actions. Mabel's interactions involve different circumstances, including teamwork, conflicts, cooperation, and emotional exchanges. These situations provide opportunities to examine how she uses commands, orders, requests, and suggestions to communicate her intentions. Some directive utterances can be identified through their grammatical structures, whereas others require further interpretation based on the surrounding dialogue, relationships between characters, and situational context. Therefore, Mabel's utterances provide an appropriate focus for investigating the relationship between directive forms and their intended communicative functions.

Several previous studies have investigated directive illocutionary acts in animated and non-animated movies. Ch et al. (2023), for example, examined directive illocutionary acts in two Japanese teen movies, while Khoirotusyarifah et al. (2025) investigated directive expressions in a child's utterances in *The Sea Beast*. Putra and Ardiantari (2025) also analyzed directive speech acts in *Moana 2*, demonstrating the continued relevance of animated movies as sources of pragmatic research. Furthermore, Prabawa and Permana (2024) focused on directive illocutionary acts used by the main character in *The End of the F***ing World**. These studies provide useful insights into how directive expressions are used by movie characters. However, Diatmika and Satwika (2026) have also investigated directive illocutionary acts in *Hoppers*, focusing on their contextual characteristics and the possibility of refusal. Accordingly, the present study establishes a more specific analytical focus by examining the directive utterances produced exclusively by Mabel. It investigates the distribution of directive types and considers how each type is realized through direct and indirect expressions in relation to the surrounding contexts. This character-specific approach is intended to provide a more detailed account of Mabel's use of directive language throughout the movie.

This research is expected to contribute to the study of pragmatics, particularly the analysis of directive illocutionary acts in audiovisual materials. It may also provide useful examples for English language learners in understanding how speakers communicate intentions through different linguistic structures. By examining the relationship between grammatical forms, communicative functions, and situational contexts, readers can develop a better understanding of how direct and indirect speech acts operate in interactions. In terms of research methodology, this study employs a descriptive qualitative approach to describe and interpret Mabel's directive utterances based on their linguistic characteristics and surrounding situations. Creswell and Creswell (2018) explained that qualitative research is appropriate for exploring and interpreting meanings within particular contexts. Based on these considerations, this study is entitled *Directive Illocutionary Acts Produced by Mabel in Hoppers Movie: A Speech Act Analysis*.

Based on the research background, this study addresses the following research questions: (1) What types of directive illocutionary acts are produced by Mabel in *Hoppers*? and (2) How are the directive illocutionary acts produced by Mabel identified and interpreted based on their linguistic forms, communicative functions, and surrounding contexts? Accordingly, the objectives of this study are to identify and classify the types of directive illocutionary acts produced by Mabel and to explain how each type is recognized through its direct or indirect realization, intended meaning, and situational context.

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Related Studies

Several previous studies have investigated directive illocutionary acts in movie dialogues; Wiliastini et al. (2021) analyzed Directive Illocutionary Act in Moana Movie using Kreidler's classifications and Leech's functions, applying a descriptive qualitative method. They found 40 directive utterances (11 commands, 15 requests, 14 suggestions), with request as the most dominant type. Both studies examine directives in an animated movie, but this study used different theoretical frameworks and objects of analysis.

Singal and Ambalegin (2024) examined directives in The Pixels (2015) Movie by applying Searle's theory through a descriptive qualitative method and non-participatory observation. Both studies identify directive speech acts in character dialogue, but differ in data sources and theoretical frameworks.

Insyra and Supri (2024), in Pragmatics Analysis of Directive Illocutionary Acts in Spider-Man: No Way Home Movie. The authors used Bach and Harnish's theory alongside Parker's speech-type categories. This highlights the importance of connecting form with function, though the movies and theories used differ from the current study.

Pramudita et al. (2025) found 101 directives in the A Man Called Otto Movie, used a descriptive qualitative method and found 101 directive utterances consist of 21 orders, 28 requests, 30 commands, 22 suggestions, with command as the most dominant type. This study is particularly relevant since its used Yule's classification, however it uses a different data source.

Arum (2025) analyzed ten characters inthe Inside Out 2 Movie and found 43 commands, 30 requests, 14 instructions, 8 suggestions, and 5 acts of asking, with command the most frequent. Both studies examine animated-movie directives, but this one covers ten characters while the current study focuses only on Mabel.

Zabella et al. (2025) analyzed 506 utterances in the Text of Jumanji: The Next Level Movie. The authors applied Searle's theory with question as the most common type, shaped heavily by situational context. Febriany and Afriana (2025) examined directives types in Thunderbolt Movie: Pragmatic Approach. The authors used Searle's classification and found 57 directives.

Overall, these studies show that directive illocutionary acts commonly appear in movie dialogue, though each movie has its own dominant type: requests dominated in Moana and Spider-Man: No Way Home; commands in A Man Called Otto and Inside Out 2; and asking in Pixels, Jumanji: The Next Level, Thunderbolt, and Wreck-It Ralph 2. This suggests that directive use depends on the characters, their relationships, goals, and the situations they face.

2.2 Directive Illocutionary Acts

Based on Yule's (1996) theory, directives can be classified into commands, orders, requests, and suggestions. These four types are used in this study to examine the directive illocutionary acts produced by Mabel in *Hoppers* movie.

a. Command

A command tells someone to do or stop doing something, usually expressed strongly in imperative form when the speaker is in control or the situation is urgent.

Example: "Put him down!" Mabel says this when another animal holds someone in danger, directly telling it to let go. It is a command because she wants the listener immediately do the action.

b. Order

An order reflects an authoritative or leading role, generally requiring a direct response.

Example: "Everyone, this way! Follow me!" it said during an emergency evacuation. It is an order because Mabel takes a leading role and the urgency demands immediate compliance.

c. Request

A request asks the listener to act without force, expressed directly (e.g., using "please") or by stating a need.

Example: "But we really need your help." said to the animal council. Despite its

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

declarative form, it functions as a request for assistance.

d. Suggestion

A suggestion presents an action or idea for the listener to consider, leaving them free to accept or reject it.

Example: "Oh, or, we just scare him. I bet that would work." offered after the council decides to "squish" Jerry. It is a suggestion because Mabel proposes an alternative rather than forcing compliance.

Directives can be realized directly or indirectly. A direct speech act occurs when grammatical form corresponds with communicative function, such as an imperative used to command. An indirect speech act occurs when form and function differ, such as an interrogative used to request help rather than merely ask about ability (Yule, 2010). In this research, identification considers the expected action, the participants' relationship, the situation, andthe listener's response.

3. METHODS

This study adopted a descriptive qualitative approach to examine the directive illocutionary acts produced by Mabel in *Hoppers*. Creswell and Creswell (2018) explained that qualitative research aims to explore and understand the meanings individuals or groups assign to a particular social or human issue. This approach is appropriate for analyzing linguistic expressions because their meanings cannot always be determined solely through grammatical structures but also depend on speakers' intentions and communicative contexts (Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996). Since this research focuses on identifying and interpreting directive utterances in movie dialogues, a descriptive qualitative method was considered suitable for presenting the linguistic characteristics and contextual meanings of the data without manipulating the research setting.

The data consisted of Mabel's utterances containing directive illocutionary acts in *Hoppers*. The primary data source was the movie's English subtitles, which were cross-checked against the corresponding scenes to ensure that the utterances were interpreted within their appropriate contexts. Data collection was conducted through documentation and non-participant observation. First, the researcher watched the movie several times using English subtitles to become familiar with the storyline and characters' interactions. Second, all utterances produced by Mabel that potentially contained directive functions were identified and documented. Third, the relevant scenes were reviewed to examine the speaker's intention, the listener's identity, the interactional situation, and the action expected from the listener. This contextual examination was necessary because pragmatic meaning is influenced by the relationship between linguistic expressions and the circumstances in which they occur (Cutting, 2002; Thomas, 1995). Finally, utterances that did not perform directive functions were excluded from the dataset. Repeated expressions conveying the same intention within a single turn were treated as one datum, whereas utterances expressing clearly different intended actions were recorded separately.

Data analysis was carried out through four stages. First, each selected utterance was interpreted by considering its surrounding dialogue, communicative purpose, and situational context. Second, the utterances were classified into four categories: commands, orders, requests, and suggestions, following Yule's (1996, 2010) classification of directive speech acts. This classification was supported by the view that directive expressions are used to influence or encourage listeners to perform particular actions (Searle, 1979). Third, each utterance was examined to determine whether it was expressed directly or indirectly. This identification involved comparing its grammatical structure with its intended communicative function. Following Yule (2010), an utterance was considered direct when its grammatical form corresponded to its communicative purpose, whereas an indirect utterance performed a function different from what its grammatical structure conventionally indicated. Finally, the frequency and percentage of each directive category were calculated to describe the distribution of the identified data.

The numerical results were subsequently supported by qualitative descriptions of representative utterances.

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

Each selected example was explained by examining its linguistic form, intended meaning, and surrounding context to demonstrate the basis for its classification. This combination of descriptive interpretation and frequency calculation provided a systematic account of the directive illocutionary acts produced by Mabel throughout the movie.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study revealed that directives were included when Mabel tried to make the listeners perform, stop, and consider an action.The researcher identified 71 directive utterances produced by Mabel which shown through below table:

Table 1. Distribution of Mabel's Directive Illocutionary Acts

Types of Directive Illocutionary Act	Frequency	Percentage
Command	39	54.9%
Order	5	7.0%
Request	18	25.4%
Suggestion	9	12.7%
Total	**71**	**100%**

Source: *Hoppers (2026)*

Commands were the dominant type, accounting for 39 of 71 data (54.9%). Requests were second with 18 data (25.4%), followed by suggestions with 9 data (12.7%) and orders with 5 data (7.0%). The dominance of commands reflects Mabel's frequent involvement in urgent situations. She often needs another character to stop, escape, release someone, return an object, or act immediately. Orders are less frequent because they require a context in which Mabel has authority or takes a clear leadership role, rather than simply using a strong imperative.

4.1 Command



Figure 1. *Mabel commands King George to move a beaver (00:32:23)*

Utterance: *"Move a beaver there, so we can take it back."*

This utterance is a direct command because Mabel uses the imperative verb "move" to tell King George what action he must perform. She expects him to place a beaver in the specified location so that they can take it back. The grammatical form and directive function therefore correspond directly.

Commands were not limited to imperative forms. Expressions such as "You just gotta be, like, very still and watch and listen" were classified as indirect commands because the declarative form communicates an instruction. This supports the view that the function of a directive cannot be decided from sentence type alone.

Table 2. Distribution of Mabel's Command Illocutionary Acts

Utterance	Type	Direct / Indirect	Brief Explanation
"Wait! Hey! Stop!"	Command	Direct	Urgently tells the workers to stop.
"Hey, put that down."	Command	Direct	Requires the listener to put an object down.
"Then come take it out."	Command	Direct	Tells Jerry to remove the object himself.
"You just gotta be, like, very still and watch and listen."	Command	Indirect	A declarative form functions as an instruction.

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

"You gotta give it a sec, Jerry."	Command	Indirect	Instructs Jerry to wait briefly.
"Let me go."	Command	Direct	Demands her release.
"Jerry, you can't just take their homes."	Command	Indirect	Functions as a prohibition.
"Tell me where it's loudest."	Command	Direct	Asks for the location of the loudest noise through an imperative.
"Summon the Council."	Command	Direct	Tells King George to call the Council.
"George, you gotta push back."	Command	Indirect	Necessity expression functions as an instruction to resist.

Source: *Hoppers (2026)*

The table above shows that command are the most common frequent type of directive illocutionary act in Mabel's utterances. They are generally used when Mabel wants someone to perform an action, stop doing something, or immediately react to a situation. These utterances occur because mostly Mabel is dealing with serious problems and wants the other characters to do something immediately and specifically. This shows that commands are crucial in showing how active and determined Mabel is throughout the movie.

When it comes to how commands are used, this type can be identified as direct or indirect looking at the relationships between grammatical form and communicative function. Direct commands often used imperative forms and short sentences, such as "Put him down!" or "Come Back." On the other hand, indirect commands use more polite or softer ways to required someone doing something, such as "You gotta give it a sec, Jerry" or "George, you gotta push back." Even though the structure is different, both kinds of commands are meant to make someone to take actions.

4.2 Order

This is a direct order because Mabel addresses everyone involved in the activity and expects the whole group to stop immediately. The imperative "stop what you're doing" clearly states the required action, while "This is canceled" reinforces her decision and position of control in the situation.

The small number of orders shows that forcefulness alone was not treated as authority. An imperative was categorized as an order only when the scene showed Mabel directing a group or carrying out a plan from a leadership position. This distinction prevented every strong command from automatically being labeled an order.



Figure 2. *Mabel orders the group to stop their activity. (00:07:57)*

Utterance: *"Everyone, stop what you're doing! This is canceled."*

Table 3. Distribution of Mabel's Order Illocutionary Acts

Utterance	Type	Direct / Indirect	Brief Explanation
"Everyone, stop what you're doing! This is canceled."	Order	Direct	Addresses the whole group and assumes control.
"Jerry, Plan B!"	Order	Indirect	Cues Jerry to perform the agreed plan.
"Everyone! Listen to me."	Order	Direct	Assumes emergency leadership and addresses the group.
"Get out of here while you still	Order	Direct	Directs the group to evacuate during

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

can."			danger.
"Everyone, this way. Follow me. Let's go. Come on."	Order	Direct	Leads the group to safety and expects compliance.

Source: *Hoppers (2026)*

The table above provides five orders produced by Mabel. Unlike commands, which are meant to get someone to perform a particular action, these utterances are identified in situations where Mabel takes a leadership role and expects a group or other characters to follow her instructions. For instance, "Everyone, this. Follow me. Let's go. Come on" shows Mabel directing others during an evacuation. Therefore, the classification of an utterance as an order depends not only on how it's worded, but also on the context and Mabel's role in that situation.

Regarding directness, direct orders clearly state the action expected from the listener, usually through imperative forms, as in"Everyone! Listen to me" and "Get out of here while you still can." Meanwhile, an indirect order gives the same instruction but in a more subtle or less obvious way. For example, "Jerry, plan B!" this utterance, does not directly describe the action of Jerry must perform, but it functions as an order because she expects him to follow their agreed plan.

4.3 Request

This utterance is a direct request for information. Mabel explicitly tells the baby ducks to provide the location of a beaver, while "please" softens the imperative and shows that she is asking rather than exercising authority. The expected response is for the ducks to give her the requested information.

Other requests were expressed through please, permission questions, or statements of need. For example, "But we really need your help" does not contain an imperative, yet the context makes the intended action clear: the Council is expected to assist. Requests therefore show the strongest evidence that directive meaning may be indirect.



Figure 3. *Mabel requests the baby ducks to tell her where she can find a beaver. (00:24:22)*

Utterance: *"Baby ducks, please. Tell me where to find a beaver."*

Table 4. Distribution of Mabel's Request Illocutionary Acts

Utterance	Type	Direct / Indirect	Brief Explanation
"Sign here to save a rare and beautiful place ..."	Request	Direct	Asks a resident to sign her petition.
"So, what do you say?"	Request	Indirect	Seeks agreement to sign the petition.
"Doc! I need your help."	Request	Indirect	States a need to ask Dr. Sam for assistance.
"Do you know where I could find a beaver?"	Request	Indirect	Asks the listener to provide information.
"Baby ducks, please. Tell me where to find a beaver."	Request	Direct	Explicitly asks for information; "please" softens it.
"You-you coming?"	Request	Indirect	Functions as an invitation to follow her.

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

"Please, we're running out of time."	Request	Indirect	Implicitly asks the beaver to help immediately.
"Come back! ... Please."	Request	Direct	Makes a plea using "please."
"I really need a moment with you. Can we just talk one-on-one?"	Request	Indirect	Asks King George for a private conversation.
"But we really need your help!"	Request	Indirect	Asks the Council to assist by stating a need.
"Wait! You don't have to do this!"	Request	Indirect	Pleads with the attacker not to continue.

Source: *Hoppers (2026)*

The table provides 18 requests in Mabel's utterances. These utterances are used when the main character is looking for help, information, permission, or cooperation from other characters. Some requests are stated explicitly, while others are expressed indirectly through the statements. For instance, "Baby ducks, please. Tell me where to find a beaver" shows Mabel is directly asking for information, while "Doc! I need your help!" means her need for assistance. These examples show that requests allow Mabel to get support from others to achieve her goals.

Some requests are considered as direct if the utterance explicitly shows the desired action, such as "Please don't do this." On the other side, some requests are considered indirect when the intended request is conveyed through a question or statement, rather than as direct request. For instance, "Do you know where I could find a beaver? This classified as an indirect request since Mabel expects the listener to give information.

4.4 Suggestion

Mabel offers a possible alternative to the Council's plan. The proposal is presented for consideration, and the listeners may accept or reject it. This lower degree of obligation distinguishes the suggestion from a command or order.

Suggestions also appeared through forms such as "could," "let's," and inclusive expressions of necessity. Their classification depended on whether Mabel proposed a shared course of action instead of demanding compliance. This contextual distinction was particularly important for utterances containing "we," because they could express either an urgent instruction or a joint proposal.



Figure 4. *Mabel suggests scaring Jerry as an alternative plan. (00:49:47)*

Utterance: *"Or we just scare him. I bet that would work."*

Table 5. Distribution of Mabel's Suggestion Illocutionary Acts

Utterance	Type	Direct / Indirect	Brief Explanation
"Dr. Sam, you could save the glade."	Suggestion	Indirect	Presents saving the glade as a possible action.
"You could find a beaver and get it to move back to the glade."	Suggestion	Indirect	"Could" proposes a possible course of action.

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

"We have, like, one day ... so let's go."	Suggestion	Direct	"Let's" proposes that they leave together.
"We can stop it, you and me. What do you say?"	Suggestion	Indirect	Proposes cooperation and leaves acceptance to the listener.
"Fellow animals! ... I say we take back the glade."	Suggestion	Indirect	Proposes a collective course of action.
"Or we-we just scare him. I bet that would work."	Suggestion	Indirect	Offers scaring Jerry as an alternative.
"We gotta get George."	Suggestion	Indirect	Proposes rescuing George as the next action.
"Okay, let's get you out of here."	Suggestion	Direct	Proposes a joint rescue action involving George.
"We need to get him to safety."	Suggestion	Indirect	Proposes the group's next rescue action.

Source: *Hoppers (2026)*

The table above presents nine suggestions produced by Mabel. These utterances generally mention actions or solutions that might help to solve a problem. Different with commands and orders, these suggestions provide an idea for consideration rather than forcing the listener to do actions. For instance, "Dr. Sam, you could save the glade" still suggests a small possible effort, while "Or we-we just scare him. I bet that would work" offers an alternative solution. These examples show how Mabel contributes ideas and encourages other characters to consider different courses of action.

In terms of clarity, direct suggestions offer an action, often through expression such as "let's," as in "Okay, let's get you out of here." Meanwhile, indirect suggestions convey ideas with less explicit structures, such as statements containing "can" or "we need." For instance, "You could find a beaver and get it to move back to the glade" this indirectly offers a possible course of action. The differentiation is based on the method of presenting a suggestion, but its purpose is still suggest an action to be taken.

Discussion

The findings reveal that Mabel's use of directive illocutionary acts is closely associated with her role and the situations she encounters throughout the movie. Commands represent the most frequently identified category, reflecting her tendency to encourage immediate action when facing urgent circumstances, conflicts, and potential dangers. This pattern suggests that the choice of directive expressions is influenced by the speaker's communicative purpose and the demands of a particular situation. Similar findings were reported by Widianingsih et al. (2025), who identified commands as the most frequently used directive type in *Up* (2009). Arum (2025) also found that commands were prominent in *Inside Out 2*, indicating that characters frequently use directive expressions to influence others' actions and manage interactions. In Mabel's case, the frequent use of commands illustrates how directive expressions serve as a means of responding to immediate problems and coordinating actions.

In contrast, requests generally occur when Mabel needs assistance, information, permission, or cooperation from other characters. These expressions indicate situations in which she attempts to obtain something from listeners rather than directly determine their actions. The use of requests reflects the interpersonal dimension of directive communication, particularly when speakers seek cooperation from others. Febriany and Afriana (2025), for example, identified several forms of directives, including asking and requesting, in *Thunderbolt*. Their findings demonstrate that directive expressions can serve different

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

communicative purposes depending on the interaction. Meanwhile, suggestions appear when Mabel introduces possible solutions or encourages other characters to consider particular courses of action. Orders, on the other hand, are less frequent and mainly occur when she takes a leading role or coordinates actions during emergency situations. These differences demonstrate that the selection of directive expressions depends on the speaker's communicative intention, position in the interaction, and surrounding circumstances.

The predominance of commands in this study is consistent with the findings reported by Pramudita et al. (2025), Arum (2025), and Widianingsih et al. (2025), who also identified commands as a prominent or dominant directive category in their respective movie analyses. However, the results differ from those of Wiliastini et al. (2021), whose investigation of *Moana* identified requests as the most frequently used directive type. More recent research by Nabila and Fitrawati (2025) on *Turning Red* also identified commands as the most frequent directive category, while Permata and Fitriani (2025) found commands and advice to be prominent in their analysis of the same movie. These differences suggest that the distribution of directive illocutionary acts may be associated with characters' narrative roles, interpersonal relationships, and the communicative situations presented throughout a storyline rather than simply the animated or non-animated nature of a movie. Other studies, including Febriola et al. (2022) and Putra and Ardiantari (2025), further demonstrate the relevance of examining directive expressions in relation to the interactions and communicative purposes represented by movie characters.

Furthermore, the findings emphasize the importance of examining contextual information when identifying directive illocutionary acts. This is particularly relevant because some of Mabel's utterances are expressed through declarative or interrogative grammatical structures rather than explicit imperative forms. For example, the expression "We need help" may initially appear to be a statement that provides information. However, when interpreted within a particular scene, it may function as an indirect directive intended to obtain assistance from other characters. This interpretation is consistent with Fadhliatul's (2023) analysis of directive speech acts in the short film *Makr*, which examined how directives could be realized through different forms, including direct and indirect speech acts. Setiawan and Juanda (2025) also identified declarative, imperative, and interrogative forms in the directive utterances analyzed in *Twelve Angry Men*. These studies support the importance of considering both linguistic structure and communicative purpose when interpreting utterances. Therefore, identifying the illocutionary function of an utterance requires more than examining its grammatical construction; the speaker's intention, the listener's response, and the surrounding situation must also be considered.

The distinction between direct and indirect realizations is also relevant to understanding Mabel's utterances. Direct directives occur when the grammatical structure corresponds to the intended communicative function, whereas indirect directives convey their purposes through different grammatical forms. Recent research by Annisa and Yanti (2024) on *John Wick: Chapter 4* examined both the types and strategies of directive speech acts, identifying direct and indirect strategies in the characters' utterances. Similarly, Setiawan and Juanda (2025) demonstrated that directive functions may be expressed through declarative, imperative, and interrogative forms. These findings reinforce the argument that grammatical form alone is insufficient to determine the function of an utterance. Instead, the relationship between linguistic structure, communicative intention, and situational context provides a more comprehensive basis for interpreting directive illocutionary acts.

5. CONCLUSION

This study have identifiedfour types of directive illocutionary acts in Mabel’s utterances in Hoppers: commands, orders, requests, and suggestions. From 71 data, commands were the most frequent with 39 occurrences (54.9%), followed by 18 requests (25.4%), 9 suggestions (12.7%),and 5 orders (7.0%). Commands were dominant

because Mabel often communicated in urgent situations that required immediate action.

Each type was identified by considering more than grammatical structure. Imperatives commonly realized direct commands and orders, but declarative and interrogative forms could indirectly function as commands, requests, or suggestions. The classification therefore depended on Mabel's intention, the expected action, her relationship with the listener, and the situation of the scene. These findings show that directive meaning is created through the interaction between linguistic form and context.

Ethical Considerations

This study analyzed publicly available audiovisual material from the movie *Hoppers* and its English subtitles. It did not involve human participants, interviews, or personal data. Therefore, informed consent was not required. The analysis was conducted objectively, with attention to the accuracy of the dialogue, scene context, and interpretation of the characters' utterances.

Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence

AI tools were used solely to assist with language editing, proofreading, and manuscript refinement. The identification, classification, analysis, and interpretation of the directive illocutionary acts, as well as the research findings and conclusions, were conducted and verified by the researchers.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research received no specific grant or financial support from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

6. REFERENCES

Arum, A. D. J. (2025). Directive speech act analysis in "Inside Out 2" movie utterances. *Jolly Journal of English Education, 3*(2), 112–120. https://doi.org/10.63435/jjee.v3i2.166

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. MIT Press.

Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2002). *Film art: An introduction*. McGraw-Hill.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Ch, G. A., Mulyadi, & Handayani, D. S. (2023). Directive illocutionary acts in Japanese teen movies *Peach Girl* and *Miseinen Dakedo Kodomo Janai*. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 8*(1), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v8i1.6067

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Cruse, A. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

Dewi, E. S., & Jannah, R. (2022). Illocutionary acts analysis of the main character in the *Brave* movie. *JALL: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy, 6*(1), 42–54.

Diatmika, I. P. W., & Satwika, I. G. A. A. S. (2026). Directive illocutionary acts in *Hoppers*: A contextual analysis of refusal possibility. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 14*(2).

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

Febriany, M., & Afriana, A. (2025). An analysis of directive speech act in

Thunderbolt movie: Pragmatic approach. *Jurnal Basis, 12*(2), 167–176. https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v12i2.10154

Febriola, N. K. N., Maharani, P. D., & Putri, I. G. A. V. W. (2022). Directive illocutionary act produced by the characters in *Cruella* movie. *LITE: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya, 18*(2), 123–131. https://doi.org/10.33633/lite.v18i2.5834

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics* (3rd ed.). Hodder Education.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Indrayani, M. D., Sukmaningrum, R., & Setyorini, A. (2022). An analysis of directive speech acts used in the *Little Women* (2019) movie. *The 2nd Undergraduate Conference on Applied Linguistics, Linguistics, and Literature, 2*(1), 134–145.

Insyra, Z. S., & Supri, I. Z. (2024). Pragmatic analysis of directive illocutionary acts in *Spider-Man: No Way Home* movie. *English Journal Literacy Utama, 8*(2), 152–162. https://doi.org/10.33197/ejlutama.v8i2.259

Jaganegara, H. (2024). Using directive speech acts to understand the dialogue in a short film script: A case of *Admit One*. *Jurnal Bahasa Asing, 17*(2), 47–59. https://doi.org/10.58220/jba.v17i2.86

Khoirotusyarifah, Sulaeman, D., Aminuddin, M., & Sajidin. (2025). Directive illocutionary acts in a child's utterances in *The Sea Beast* movie (2022). *IDEAS: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 13*(1), 555–568. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i1.6534

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Nurcahyadi, Y. K., Candra, K. D. P., & Maharani, P. D. (2024). Directive illocutionary act found in *The Commuter* film. *LITERA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 10*(2), 24–29.

Prabawa, I. D. G. B., & Permana, I. P. A. (2024). Directive illocutionary act used by the main character in *The End of the F***ing World**. *Humanis: Journal of Arts and Humanities, 28*(1), 110–121. https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2024.v28.i01.p10

Pramudita, T., Triyogo, A., & Oktaviani, A. (2025). An analysis of directive speech act in the *A Man Called Otto* movie. *Tuturan: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, Sosial dan Humaniora, 3*(2), 20–37. https://doi.org/10.47861/tuturan.v3i2.1629

Putra, G. E. S., & Ardiantari, I. A. P. G. (2025). An analysis of the directive speech act found in the *Moana 2* movie. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 13*(2), 4774–4783. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i2.7847

Putra, I. G. K. D., & Candra, K. D. P. (2024). An analysis of directive speech acts found in *The Expendables 2* movie. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning,*

Linguistics and Literature, 12(2), 2404–2414. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v12i2.6018

Putra, I. K. A. W. P., & Satwika, I. G. A. A. S. (2025). Directive speech acts in the animated sci-fi film *Next Gen*: A pragmatic analysis. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 13*(2), 5827–5836. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i2.7992

Putra, I. P. A., & Sedeng, I. N. (2022). Directive illocutionary acts found in the movies *21* and *22 Jump Street*. *Humanis, 26*(2), 180–189. https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2022.v26.i02.p03

Saragih, D. Y., Sinaga, Y. K., Herman, Purba, R., Saragi, C. N., & Manurung, L. W. (2022). The analysis of directive illocutionary acts on some conversations in *The Miracle Worker* movie. *Sarcouncil Journal of Arts and Literature, 1*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6519387

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173438

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge University Press.

Silaen, E., Mutiah, Ndruru, M., & Afriana. (2022). An analysis of directive speech acts used by the main character in the *Dunkirk* movie. *Proceedings of the Undergraduate Conference on Literary, Linguistic, and Cultural Studies, 1*(1).

Singal, C. I. J., & Ambalegin, A. (2024). Directive speech act analysis in the utterances expressed in the *Pixels* (2015) movie. *IdeBahasa, 5*(2), 287–294. https://doi.org/10.37296/idebahasa.v5i2.131

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.

Trihanto, A., Astuti, P. I., & Arumi, S. (2022). An analysis of the directive speech act found in the *Jumanji: The Next Level* movie directed by Jake Kasdan. *International Journal of English Linguistics, Literature, and Education, 4*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.32585/ijelle.v4i1.2175

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1994). *English conversation*. Oxford University Press.

Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and speech acts: Volume 1. Principles of language use*. Cambridge University Press.

Widianingsih, A. W. S., Mustika, R., & Nugraha, S. (2025). An analysis of directive speech acts in the *Up* (2009) movie. *JEPAL: Journal of English Pedagogy and Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 199–210. https://doi.org/10.32627/jepal.v5i2.1223

Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English speech act verbs: A semantic dictionary*. Academic Press.

Wiliastini, A. M., Suastini, N. W., & Juniartha, I. W. (2021). Directive illocutionary act in *Moana* movie. *Elysian Journal: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies, 1*(1), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.36733/elysian.v1i1.1546

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Vol 9, No 2 (2026): ESTEEM

Zabella, P. Z. Z., Susanto, D. A., & Setyaji, A. (2025). An analysis of directive speech acts in the text of *Jumanji: The Next Level* movie directed by Jake Kasdan. *Indonesian Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, *2*(2), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.61251/ijoep.v2i2.183

DIRECTIVE ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS PRODUCED BY MABEL IN "HOPPERS" MOVIE: A SPEECH ACT ANALYSIS