

An Analysis of Directive Speech Acts Used by The Main Character in *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) Film

Nina Maulidya Rachman¹, Muhammad Alim Akbar Nasir²

^{1,2}English Literature Department, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Mulawarman University
Email: ninamaulidyarachman13@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis jenis-jenis tindak tutur langsung yang direpresentasikan oleh karakter utama dalam film *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024). Penelitian ini menggunakan teori tindak tutur langsung dari Searle & Vanderveken (1985). Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis tindak tutur langsung yang digunakan oleh dua karakter utama, yaitu Deadpool dan Wolverine. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian deskriptif kualitatif. Data penelitian berupa tuturan dari dialog karakter dalam film yang dianalisis menggunakan perangkat penanda kekuatan ilokusi (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices/IFIDs). Data dikumpulkan dengan menonton film, membaca naskah, dan mengidentifikasi serta mengkategorikan data. Berdasarkan analisis, peneliti mengidentifikasi total tiga belas jenis tindak tutur langsung dari dua puluh empat yang diteliti. Jenis-jenis tersebut antara lain permintaan, bertanya, mendesak, memberi tahu, menuntut, perintah, instruksi, melarang, melarang (secara resmi), saran, peringatan, nasihat dan memohon. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa jenis perintah yang paling banyak digunakan mengindikasikan bahwa tokoh utama kerap menggunakan tuturan direktif untuk menegaskan kontrol, menyampaikan urgensi, serta memengaruhi tindakan dalam situasi interaksional.

Kata kunci: Linguistik, Pragmatik, Tindak Tutur, Tindak Tutur Langsung

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the types of directive speech acts represented by the main characters in the film *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024). This study applies the theory of directive speech acts proposed by Searle and Vanderveken (1985). The purpose of this research is to examine the directive speech acts used by the two main characters, Deadpool and Wolverine. This research employs a descriptive qualitative method. The research data consist of utterances taken from the characters' dialogues in the film, analyzed using Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs). The data were collected by watching the film, reading the script, and identifying as well as categorizing the utterances. Based on the analysis, the researcher identified thirteen directive speech acts out of twenty-four examined in the theory. These types include request, ask, urge, tell, demand, command, order, forbid, prohibit, suggest, warn, advise, and beg. The results show that command is the most frequently used directive speech act, which indicates that the main characters often employ directives to assert control, express urgency, and influence actions within interactional situations.

Keywords: Linguistics, Pragmatics, Speech Act, Directive Speech Act

A. INTRODUCTION

Film as an audiovisual medium does not only function as entertainment but also serves as a space where complex linguistic interactions are represented. The dialogues between characters reflect various speech acts that convey speakers' intentions, interpersonal relations, and situational contexts. One type of speech act that frequently appears in character interactions is directive speech acts, which are used by speakers to influence, direct, or restrict the actions of others. The realization of directive speech acts in film is particularly interesting to examine because directives are not always expressed through direct commands, but may appear in various linguistic forms depending on communicative purposes and interactional situations.

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) classify illocutionary acts into five categories, which are assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Among these categories, directive speech acts function to get the hearers to do something or to make the situation match the speaker's intention (Pérez-Hernández, 2020). This function is different compared to other speech acts categories. Previous studies have examined directive speech acts across different objects and contexts. Fadilah (2023) analyzed directive speech acts in the film *Mulan*, emphasizing the use of directives within hierarchical and duty-driven interactions. Sari (2022) investigated directive speech acts in the film *Up*, focusing on several directive types that primarily support narrative progression. Other studies, such as John et al. (2019), explored directive speech acts in professional communication, while Simon and Cartis (2015) examined directives in written advertising discourse. However, many of these studies tend to limit the range of directive types or treat directives mainly as functional tools, leaving room for a more comprehensive analysis of how various directive forms are realized and distributed in film dialogue.

Based on this research gap, the present study employs a film as the object of analysis to examine the representation of directive speech acts in character interactions. *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) is selected because it presents frequent and dynamic exchanges between the two main characters across different situations, including conflict, cooperation, and negotiation. These interactional conditions provide rich data for observing how directive speech acts are used to manage actions, influence responses, and convey communicative intentions.

Therefore, this study aims to investigate how the types of directive speech acts are represented in the dialogues of the main characters in *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024). The focus is placed on identifying the directive types that occur and analyzing their realization in relation to interactional contexts and communicative needs. Through this approach, the study seeks to contribute to pragmatic studies by offering a clearer understanding of how directive speech acts are represented in cinematic discourse.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Speech Acts

Yule (1996) states that actions performed via utterances are generally called speech acts. Speech acts are a study of how the speakers and hearers use language. One may conclude that a speech act is an action made by a speaker during the speaking of a sentence. The speech act's goal is to convey the speaker's intention to the listener. The theoretical framework used is the speech act theory introduced by John Searle. There are three types of speech acts, locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Locutionary act is a speech act that refers to the utterance itself, the production of an utterance with a literal meaning. Illocutionary act is a speech act that shows the purpose or intention behind an utterance, and perlocutionary act refers to the effect that an utterance has on the hearer.

2. Classification of Illocutionary Act

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) classified illocutionary acts into five categories: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives. Assertives are illocutionary acts in which the speaker expresses a belief about the truth of a proposition. Directives are speech acts in which

the speaker attempts to get the hearer to do something. Commissives involve the speaker committing themselves to a future course of action. Expressives are speech acts that express the speaker's psychological state or emotional response toward a particular situation. Declaratives are illocutionary acts in which the speaker's utterance brings about a change in the external situation by the very act of being spoken.

3. Directive Speech Acts

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), directive speech acts are defined as those whose illocutionary point is "to commit the hearer to doing something." Similarly, Yule (1996) defines directive speech acts as utterances "that speakers use to get someone else to do something" and emphasizes that the hearer expresses what the speaker wants.

a. Direct

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), direct represents the simplest and most straightforward form of a directive act. For example: "Close the door." The example sentence shows a direct directive expressed through a bare imperative. The speaker's intention is explicit with no mitigation

b. Request

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), the illocutionary point of a request is still to get the hearer to do something, but the illocutionary force is generally weaker and often dependent on mutual understanding or cooperation. Requests are commonly used in both formal and informal settings. For example: "Could you pass me the salt?" (Márquez Reiter, 2000). In this example, the modal verb "could" softens the directive force and signals a polite request.

c. Ask

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), ask can function both as a request for information and as a directive act. In its directive sense, ask is used when the speaker expresses a wish for the hearer to perform an action, but with minimal imposition. For example: "Can you tell me where the station is?" (Tsui, 1994). This utterance asks the hearer to provide information. The interrogative form and the modal "can" show that the speaker seeks cooperation.

d. Urge

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define urge as a directive act where the speaker strongly encourages the hearer to perform an action. For example: "You really should try to talk to her before it's too late" (Braun, 2004). In this utterance, the speaker strongly encourages the hearer to perform an action. The adverb "really" and modal "should" express insistence, marking it as an urging act.

e. Tell

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), tell serves as a directive act in which the speaker expresses an expectation that the hearer will act according to the utterance. For example: "Tell him to come inside." (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). This example shows the speaker instructing the hearer to transmit a directive to a third party. The imperative "tell" conveys an expectation that the hearer will perform the instructed action.

f. Require

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define require as a directive in which the speaker expresses necessity or obligation for the hearer to perform the act. For example: “You are required to submit the form today”. The modal “are required to” signals obligation. The directive imposes necessity based on rules or external authority.

g. Demand

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), demand represents a directive act with strong illocutionary force, in which the speaker insists that the hearer perform an action. It is similar to require, but demand adds a higher level of insistence and urgency. For example: “I demand that you leave immediately” (Searle, 1979). The performative verb “demand” directly encodes strong illocutionary force, indicating that the speaker insists on immediate compliance from the hearer.

h. Command

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define command as a type of directive speech act in which the speaker, typically holding a position of authority, attempts to get the hearer to carry out a specific action. Commands are characterized by strong illocutionary force, meaning that they are performed with a high degree of obligation directed at the hearer. For example: “Stand up straight!” (Ervin-Tripp, 1976). The imperative form and absence of politeness markers create a forceful instruction. Commands typically assume speaker authority and immediate compliance.

i. Order

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), an order is a directive speech act issued by a speaker who expects compliance, often due to a social, professional, or institutional power dynamic. The illocutionary point remains to get the hearer to do something, but an order can carry an even more authoritative force, frequently accompanied by a sense of urgency or non-negotiable expectation. For example: “Soldiers, advance!” (Leech, 1983). The utterance carries institutional authority, typical in military contexts. The imperative verb paired with the institutional role of the speaker marks this directive as an order.

j. Forbid

Forbid is a directive speech act where the speaker explicitly prohibits the hearer from performing a particular action. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) classify forbidding as a strong form of negative directive, where the illocutionary force functions to prevent an act rather than encourage it. For example: “I forbid you to speak to him again” (Searle, 1979). The explicit performative “forbid” directly signals the illocutionary force, expressing prohibition backed by the speaker’s authority.

k. Prohibit

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), prohibit is closely related to forbid but differs in its formality and context. While forbid can be used in interpersonal interaction, prohibit is typically used in legal or institutional discourse. For example: “Smoking is prohibited in this area” (Blackstone, 2003). Although written in the passive voice, the performative verb “prohibited” expresses an institutional rule that restricts behavior, fitting the category of prohibit-type directives.

l. Enjoin

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define enjoin as a directive that combines the force of command and permit. It expresses a moral, legal, or religious obligation for the hearer to perform a certain act. For example: “I enjoin you to stay focused during the procedure”. The explicit

performative “enjoin” expresses a formal directive with a sense of duty or moral urging, making the expectation of compliance clear.

m. Permit

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), permit functions as a directive in which the speaker allows or authorizes the hearer to perform a certain action. For example: “You may start the presentation now.” The utterance grants permission, allowing the hearer to perform an action.

n. Suggest

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), a suggestion functions as a communicative act in which the speaker proposes a course of action for the hearer to consider, without placing obligation or pressure on them. The speaker may believe the suggestion is beneficial or helpful, but leaves the decision entirely to the hearer’s judgment. For example: “I suggest you take the earlier train” (Koike, 1994). The verb “suggest” marks a lower-force directive where the speaker offers advice without imposing obligation.

o. Insist

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), insist expresses persistence or determination by the speaker for the hearer to perform an act that may already have been requested. For example: “I insist that you stay until the meeting ends.” The verb insist marks a firm directive. The speaker shows strong commitment to the action being carried out, leaving little room for refusal.

p. Warn

Warn is a directive speech act in which the speaker alerts the hearer about a potential negative outcome that may occur if a certain action is taken or not taken. Searle and Vanderveken’s (1985) state that warn carries an anticipatory illocutionary force, where the speaker does not necessarily command an action, but strongly implies that avoiding or altering the hearer’s behavior is desirable for safety or well-being. For example: “Watch out, the car is coming!” (Yule, 1996). The utterance alerts the hearer to immediate danger. The exclamatory form and urgency signal a warning directive.

q. Advise

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define advice as a directive in which the speaker attempts to guide the hearer toward a specific action based on the speaker’s perceived knowledge, experience, or concern. For example: “You should see a doctor about that cough,” the modal “should”, indicates a certain level of obligation but remains within the framework of giving advice (Holmes, 2017).

r. Recommend

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define recommend as a directive similar to advise but with weaker illocutionary strength. The speaker merely expresses approval or preference for a possible course of action, without assuming any obligation on the part of the hearer. For example: “I recommend taking a break before continuing.” The verb “recommend” shows a mild, advisory directive. It suggests an action beneficial to the hearer without imposing obligation.

s. Beg

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), beg is a directive characterized by humility and emotional appeal. It expresses the speaker’s strong desire for the hearer to perform the action, often involving lowered social status or a submissive attitude. For example: “Please, I’m begging

you to stay” (Wierzbicka, 1987). The explicit phrase “I’m begging you” and the emotive “please” indicate heightened emotional dependence, typical of beg directives.

t. Supplicate

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) describe supplicate as a formal or religious form of request directed toward a higher authority or divine being. The illocutionary point is similar to beg, but the act carries solemnity and reverence rather than interpersonal humility. For example: “I supplicate you to give me just another chance.” The verb supplicate signals a humble, earnest plea. The directive force comes from the speaker’s low position and strong emotional appeal for compliance.

u. Entreat

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), entreat expresses a polite but emotional appeal by the speaker for the hearer to perform an act. The act lies between beg and implore in strength, representing earnestness without desperation. For example: “I entreat you to stay and hear me out.” The explicit performative “entreat” conveys a deeply earnest request marked by emotional appeal, yet still weaker in force than begging.

v. Beseech

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define beseech as a directive expressing deep emotion and urgency. It is closely related to entreat but stronger in illocutionary force, often used to convey a heartfelt or desperate appeal. For example: “I beseech you to reconsider this decision.” The performative “beseech” indicates an urgent and respectful plea, expressing strong emotional intensity while appealing to the hearer’s goodwill.

w. Implore

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), implore is a directive characterized by intense emotional force and a sense of desperation. The act presupposes that the hearer’s compliance is crucial to the speaker’s need or desire. For example: “I implore you to help us before it’s too late.” The word “Implore” marks an intense and urgent plea, stronger than beseech or entreat, showing the speaker’s desperation and the critical need for compliance.

x. Pray

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) describe pray as a directive act addressed to a divine being rather than another person. The illocutionary point resembles beg and supplicate, but the context is religious or spiritual. The speaker expresses humility, reverence, and dependence on divine will. For example: “I pray you don’t lose hope.” A formal performative expressing a solemn appeal. Though polite and archaic, it functions as a directive encouraging the hearer’s action or attitude.

4. Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs)

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) define Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) as linguistic elements that signal the type or force of a speech act being performed. These include performative verbs, word order, intonation, stress, mood of the verb, and punctuation. These elements serve as linguistic indicators that help identify the illocutionary force of an utterance.

a. Word Order

According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), word order functions as a structural indicator that determines the illocutionary force of a sentence. The arrangement of sentence elements such as subject, verb, and auxiliary determines how an utterance is interpreted pragmatically.

b. Mood of The Verb

Verb mood is described as another grammatical indicator functioning as an IFID. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) emphasize that moods such as indicative, interrogative, imperative, and subjunctive are essential in marking whether an utterance performs an assertion, a question, or a directive. Through verb mood, speakers signal whether they are asserting information, requesting information, or directing the hearer to perform an action. For example, the imperative mood in “Leave the room” performs an order, while the interrogative mood in “Will you leave the room?” performs a question. Each mood corresponds to a distinct illocutionary point that helps identify the illocutionary force of an utterance.

c. Punctuation

Punctuation serves as a written equivalent of intonation and stress. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) include punctuation among the IFIDs because marks such as question marks and exclamation points serve as conventional indicators of the speaker’s intended illocutionary force. Punctuation operates as an IFID by signaling the speaker’s communicative intention through standardized symbols. A question mark typically marks interrogative force, while an exclamation mark signals heightened directive or expressive force. For example, “Leave the room!” signals a command, while “Leave the room?” signals a question. In written discourse, punctuation operates as a formalized representation of the illocutionary force that, in spoken language, would otherwise be conveyed prosodically.

d. Intonation Contour

Intonation contour refers to pitch movement across an utterance that differentiates questions, statements, and commands. According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), intonation is one of the prosodic features that helps distinguish illocutionary forces in spoken communication. As an IFID, intonation contour guides the hearer’s interpretation of an utterance’s function. Rising intonation is commonly associated with interrogatives and signals the speaker’s expectation of a response, whereas falling intonation typically indicates completion, certainty, or directive force. Through these pitch patterns, speakers convey their communicative intention beyond lexical meaning, making intonation an essential component in identifying illocutionary acts.

e. Stress

Stress serves as another prosodic element that indicates the strength or emphasis of the illocutionary act. According to Searle and Vanderveken (1985), stress contributes to identifying the intended force of an utterance by emphasizing particular words or syllables. A shift in stress can change the pragmatic focus or level of insistence in a directive. Stress can influence how an utterance is pragmatically interpreted by emphasizing particular words that signal urgency, obligation, or responsibility.

f. Performative Verbs

Searle and Vanderveken (1985) describe performative verbs as explicit linguistic indicators that directly express the illocutionary act being performed. A performative sentence is defined as “a performative verb used in the first-person present tense of the indicative mood with an appropriate complement clause” (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985, p. 2-3). Performative verbs function as IFIDs because the act of uttering the sentence simultaneously performs the action it describes.

C. METHOD

This research focused on the study of directive speech acts used by the main characters in the *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) film. In this research, the researcher uses descriptive qualitative research methodology to find and describe directive speech acts in the *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) film script. Creswell (1994) defines descriptive qualitative methodology as an unfolding model that occurs in a natural setting that enables the researcher to develop a level of detail from high involvement in the actual experiences. The data in this research consist of utterances in the form of words, phrases, and sentences spoken by the main characters in the film *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024). The primary source of data is the film itself, directed by Shawn Levy and produced by Marvel Studios, which was released in 2024. The film is available for streaming on Disney Hotstar.

The research instrument is a crucial part to obtain and gather data. In this research, the researcher herself acts as the primary research instrument, selecting data sources, collecting information, evaluating findings, and identifying key patterns.

The researcher proceeds through the data collection process. First, the researchers watched *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) film repeatedly to understand the overall story. Second, the researchers used film subtitles and film scripts as a way to help researchers collect data. Third, researchers underlined important data that matched the research.

The researcher classified the data that has been collected based on Searle and Vanderveken's (1985) theory. The data that has been collected was categorised into directive speech act types. The researcher concludes the data through *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) film data interpretation, in order to align with the research questions in the previous chapter.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings and discussion of directive speech acts used by the main character in *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) Film

1. Findings

a. Request

Data 2 / (00:09:17)

Deadpool: ***"Please stop writing. Look, I'm just... I wanna be an Avenger"***

The illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs) found in this utterance support its function as a request. The presence of the politeness marker "please" softens the directive. The verb "stop" appears in the imperative mood, functioning as a structural IFID for directives, while the absence of an explicit subject reinforces the standard form of English requests. The word order begins with the politeness marker followed by the imperative verb, reflecting a non-authoritative appeal. The punctuation in the form of a period rather than an exclamation mark indicates a neutral tone, suggesting that the action is expected but not demanded. These linguistic cues collectively shape the utterance as a request, in which Deadpool asks Mr. Hogan to voluntarily cease an ongoing action.

b. Ask

Data 38 / (00:54:53)

Deadpool: *“Wanna talk about what’s haunting you or should we wait for a third act flashback?”*

The utterance “Wanna talk about what’s haunting you or should we wait for a third act flashback?” displays several Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) that indicate an ask type of directive. The interrogative structure functions as the primary marker, showing that the speaker seeks the hearer’s willingness rather than imposing an obligation. The alternative question format provides options to the hearer, emphasizing autonomy and aligning with the weak illocutionary force characteristic of ask. Taken together, these IFIDs classify the utterance as ask, since the speaker invites cooperation without exerting directive pressure.

c. Urge

Data 50 / (01:09:51)

Deadpool: *“Let’s get the fuck out of this place”*

The utterance demonstrates several Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) that mark it as an urge. The key indicator is the use of the inclusive imperative form “let’s”, which expresses the speaker’s strong encouragement for immediate collective action. This construction does not impose authority in the way a command does, but instead urges the hearers by appealing to shared involvement and mutual urgency. The imperative mood in the verb phrase “get” and “out” reinforces the directive force, showing that the speaker intends for the action to take place promptly. The utterance carries a sense of immediacy, functioning to energize the hearers and move them toward action. Taken together, these IFIDs classify the utterance as an urge, as the speaker strongly encourages the hearers to act quickly based on perceived necessity and shared intention.

d. Tell

Data 6 / (00:20:26)

Deadpool: *“Why is Thor crying? Quick! Tell me”*

This utterance contains several Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) that identify it as a tell directive. The phrase “tell me” functions as an explicit directive expression, indicating that the speaker expects the hearer to provide the requested information. The presence of “quick” at the beginning of the second clause signals reinforces the expectation that the hearer should respond immediately. The imperative mood in “tell” strengthens the directive force, distinguishing it from a simple request for information.

e. Demand

Data 58 / (01:25:49)

Deadpool: *“You’re gonna send us home, or I’m gonna twist your fucking head off”*

The utterance “You’re gonna send us home, or I’m gonna twist your fucking head off” contains strong IFIDs that mark it as a demand. The structure begins with a declarative form “You’re gonna send us home”, which functions performatively to impose an obligation rather than merely state a fact. The presence of a direct threat “or I’m gonna twist your fucking head off” significantly intensifies the illocutionary force, signaling insistence and leaving no space for negotiation. This conditional threat serves to indicate that compliance is not optional. The use of the second-person pronoun “you” foregrounds the hearer as the responsible agent, while the modal construction “gonna” conveys inevitability and expectation.

f. Command

Data 36 / (00:53:28)

Wolverine: **“Shut the fuck up! Let me fucking think”**

The utterance “Shut the fuck up! Let me fucking think.” displays strong Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) that classify it as a command. The structure begins with a direct imperative verb shut, which functions as the central marker of directive force. The absence of any mitigating expressions such as modal verbs or politeness markers intensifies the obligatory nature of the instruction. The use of emphatic language and expletives further enhances the speaker’s authoritative stance, signaling urgency and frustration. The second clause, “Let me fucking think,” also uses an imperative form that reinforces the demand for immediate compliance. These collectively indicate that the speaker intends to enforce silence and expects the hearer to obey without negotiation.

g. Order

Data 75 / (01:47:58)

Wolverine: **“Open the door!”**

The utterance “Open the door!” represents a clear instance of an order within the directive category. The illocutionary force is indicated by the direct imperative structure, in which open functions as a strong verbal marker commanding immediate action. The use of an exclamation mark reflects urgency and intensifies the directive strength, reinforcing that compliance is expected without negotiation. The contextual urgency of Wolverine attempting to stop Deadpool from performing a fatal action enhances the peremptory nature of the utterance. These linguistic and contextual factors function as Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs), signaling that the speaker intends for the action to be carried out instantly and without question.

h. Forbid

Data 51 / (01:09:53)

Wolverine: **“Don’t listen to him. He’s a fucking liar!”**

The utterance “Don’t listen to him. He’s a fucking liar!” contains Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs) that clearly mark it as a forbidding act. The use of the negative imperative “don’t listen” functions as a direct linguistic signal of prohibition, instructing the hearers to refrain from a specific action. Additionally, the evaluative phrase “he’s a liar” strengthens the prohibition by providing justification, framing compliance as necessary for self-protection. These elements collectively emphasize a strong, explicit prohibition consistent with the illocutionary force of forbid.

i. Prohibit

Data 25 / (00:39:12)

Deadpool: *“Fair warning gorgeous. You’re going to encounter some indelicate language a smidge off ass play, **but we’ve been prohibited from using cocaine.**”*

This utterance shows several illocutionary force-indicating devices (IFIDs) that mark it as a prohibitive directive. The strongest indicator is the lexical item “prohibited,” which explicitly expresses that the action is not allowed. Although the sentence is structured in the passive voice, the verb still carries a performative function because it states a rule or restriction imposed by an authority. The placement of the verb phrase “been prohibited” immediately after the subject positions the prohibition as the main focus of the utterance.

j. Suggest

Data 16 / (00:31:51)

Deadpool: *“I suggest you reconsider”*

The utterance “I suggest you reconsider” contains explicit IFIDs indicating that it is a suggestion. The performative verb “suggest” directly signals the illocutionary force, making the directive intention overt. The declarative structure reduces coercion and frames the statement as a proposal rather than a requirement. Additionally, the verb “reconsider” implies that the speaker offers an alternative viewpoint for the hearer to think about, without imposing obligation. The absence of imperative mood and forceful markers further softens the directive. These collectively identify the utterance as a suggestion, where the speaker presents a possible course of action while leaving the final decision to the hearer.

k. Warn

Data 1 / (00:03:18)

Deadpool: *“I’m warning you, I’m not alone!”*

The utterance “I’m warning you, I’m not alone!” contains explicit Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices signaling a warn. The expression “I’m warning you” functions as a direct performative marker, overtly identifying the utterance as a warning. The sentence is delivered in declarative mood, reinforcing the speaker’s certainty about the danger being stated. The second clause, “I’m not alone,” provides the anticipated negative consequence, which is essential in constructing a warning. The exclamation mark heightens urgency and reflects intensified emotional force. These linguistic elements collectively signal that the utterance performs a warning, aiming to influence the hearer’s behavior by alerting them to imminent risk.

l. Advise

Data 52 / (01:11:34)

Deadpool: *“Look, he died before he could make a difference. But look, maybe you couldn’t save your worlds, but Jesus Christ, you can save mine!”*

In the utterance “you can save mine,” the illocutionary force is marked through several IFIDs that identify it as an act of advise. The modal verb “can” signals possibility and encouragement rather than obligation, which aligns with the non-coercive nature of advising. The use of a declarative structure further softens the directive force, presenting the suggested action as a reasonable option rather than an imposed requirement. These linguistic cues collectively indicate that the utterance functions as an act of advise.

m. Beg

Data 22 / (00:36:43)

Deadpool: *“I don’t wanna fight you peanut. Doesn’t matter what you did. I just need your help”*

The utterance “I don’t wanna fight you, peanut” and “I just need your help” contains several Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices that mark it as a beg directive. The use of the first-person negative statement “I don’t wanna fight you” signals vulnerability and lowers the speaker’s stance, a typical feature of begging. The phrase “I just need your help” intensifies the emotional appeal by foregrounding need rather than authority, showing that Deadpool lacks power to impose action. The informal address term “peanut” further softens the utterance, reinforcing a plea rather than a command. Collectively, these linguistic features indicate that the utterance functions as an earnest appeal for assistance, reflecting the core characteristics of the beg directive.

2. Discussion

This research examines how the types of directive speech acts are represented by the main characters in *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024). The findings demonstrate that the film contains a wide range of directive speech acts, including request, warn, command, tell, urge, suggest, beg, advise, prohibit, ask, forbid, demand, and order. The presence of thirteen directive types indicates that directives in the film are not limited to simple instructions, but are realized through various forms of linguistic strategies depending on interactional needs and situational contexts.

The findings show that the types of directive speech acts are represented through diverse realizations in the dialogues of *Deadpool* and *Wolverine*. The representation of directive speech acts is reflected in the use of various directive types that serve different communicative purposes within the interaction, including directing actions, requesting responses, restricting behavior, and influencing the hearer's decisions.

The presence of various directive types demonstrates that the main characters employ directives in a systematic and varied manner, depending on the communicative goals and situational contexts of the interaction. Through this variation, the representation of directive speech acts shows how different directive forms function together to manage interaction and convey intended actions. Thus, the types of directive speech acts in *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024) are represented through a wide range of directive forms that collectively shape the characters' interactions and dialogue structure.

The findings of this study are in line with previous studies that found directive speech acts are commonly used in different communication contexts. Similar to Fadilah (2023), who found that directive speech acts in *Mulan* are used in interactions related to duty and authority, and Sari (2022), who found that directive speech acts help move the story forward in *Up*, this study also shows that directive speech acts are widely used in the dialogues of *Deadpool & Wolverine* (2024). The findings show that the main characters use directive speech acts to direct actions, ask for responses, limit other characters' behavior, and influence their decisions. However, this study provides a more complete description by identifying thirteen types of directive speech acts, namely request, warn, command, tell, urge, suggest, beg, advise, prohibit, ask, forbid, demand, and order. This shows that directive speech acts in film dialogue are expressed in many different forms, depending on the purpose of the speaker and the situation. The findings also support the studies by John et al. (2019) and Simon and Cartis (2015), which found that directive speech acts are used to influence people's actions in professional communication and advertising. Although those studies examined different contexts, they share the same idea that directive speech acts are used to influence the hearer. Therefore, this study adds to previous research by providing a more complete picture of the different types of directive speech acts used in film dialogue, whereas earlier studies mainly focused on only a few directive types or discussed directive speech acts more generally.

D. CONCLUSION

The analysis identified 13 types of directive speech acts with the following distribution: request 6 data, warn 6 data, command 38 data, tell 3 data, urge 8 data, suggest 5 data, beg 3 data, advise 5 data, prohibit 1 data, ask 1 data, forbid 2 data, demand 1 data, and order 3 data. The findings indicate that directive speech acts are represented through a wide range of types with varying levels of illocutionary force. The findings show that the main

characters employ various directive speech acts across different interactional situations throughout the film. These directives are used to achieve multiple communicative purposes, such as directing actions, requesting cooperation, expressing urgency, restricting behavior, and influencing the hearer's decisions. The presence of multiple directive types within the dialogue demonstrates that directive speech acts are realized according to situational context and communicative intention. Furthermore, the variation in directive types reflects how the characters adjust their linguistic choices in response to different interactional needs.

Based on the findings of this research, several suggestions can be proposed for future researchers. First, future researchers are encouraged to apply directive speech act analysis to different types of objects, such as novels, short stories, comics, or other written texts. Analyzing written discourse may reveal different realizations of directive speech acts, particularly in terms of indirectness, narrative context, and character interaction. Future research may focus on examining the functions of directive speech acts within the chosen object of study.

REFERENCES

- Blackstone, W. T. (2003). *Ethics and the law*. Oxford University Press.
- Braun, F. (2004). *Advances in politeness research*. Peter Lang.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). Is Sybil there? The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 25–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006849>
- Fadilah, S. (2023). *An Analysis of Directive Speech Acts in Disney's "Mulan" Movie Script*.
- Holmes, J. (2017). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Routledge.
- John, P., Brooks, B., & Schriever, U. (2019). Speech acts in professional maritime discourse: A pragmatic risk analysis of bridge team communication directives and commissives in full-mission simulation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 140, 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.013>
- Koike, D. A. (1994). Negation in Spanish and English suggestions and requests: Mitigating effects? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(5), 513–526. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)90021-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90021-3)
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Márquez Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pérez-Hernández, L. (2020). What Contemporary Research Tells Us about Speech Acts. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*(pp. 16–68). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108677073.002>
- Sari, A. K. (2022). *An Analysis of Directive Speech Acts in "Up" Movie*. <https://etheses.iainponorogo.ac.id/21690/>
- 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.

- Simon, S., & Dejica-Cartis, D. (2015). Speech Acts in Written Advertisements: Identification, Classification and Analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 234–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.033>
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1994). *English conversation*. Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English speech act verbs: A semantic dictionary*. Academic Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press