

Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary Acts in Henry Johnson Movie (2025): A Speech Act Analysis

Nova Dyah Pitaloka¹, Sulistiani Sulistiani², Dini Arsyah Kamila³, Amanda Ravinska⁴, Farrel Adhiyatmika⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author:

Nova Dyah Pitaloka

novadyahh@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the types of speech acts in Henry Johnson's film (2025) using Austin's (1962) framework of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts and Searle's (1969) classification of speech acts. This study employs a qualitative descriptive methodology to collect and analyze the film's dialogue, elucidating the pragmatic functions inherent in the characters' speech acts. The analysis stated that speech acts function as important tools in the process of negotiation, emotion management, trust building, and interpersonal dynamics between characters. In general, this study emphasized that the film Henry Johnson (2025) practices natural communication and demonstrates the power of language in establishing social relationships, creating psychological impressions, and directing systematic interactions. This study also shown how the specific medium of film can serve as a rich venue for representation to deepen understanding of pragmatic phenomena in socialization. Thus, the results of this study are expected to add insight into the role of speech acts in constructing meaning, conflict, and resolution in cinematographic works.

Keywords: *linguistics, pragmatic, speech act, locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary, film, Henry Johnson.*

Introduction

Language is a fundamental tool in human life that enables a person to express ideas, emotions, and desires, while also building social relationships and shared understanding. Communication does not merely function as a means of exchanging information, but also as a process in which individuals perform actions and construct meaning together. According to the theory of Universal Pragmatics proposed by Jürgen Habermas (1976), the primary goal of communication is to achieve mutual understanding among participants. Successful communication, according to Habermas, occurs not only when information is conveyed correctly, but also when the speaker and listener share the same understanding of the meaning expressed. This is reinforced by Aryanto & Sitorus (2025), who emphasize that in increasingly complex societies, public communication often experiences distortions that can hinder the achievement of mutual understanding. Therefore, language functions not only as a medium for delivering messages but also as a social action that fosters cooperation, trust, and interpersonal relationships.

In linguistics, this idea aligns with pragmatic studies, which examine how language is used in context and how meaning depends on social, psychological, and linguistic factors. Leech (1983) defines pragmatics as "the study of meaning in relation to speech situations," highlighting that understanding meaning requires attention to context, the relationship between speaker and listener, and the purpose of communication. Similarly,

Yule (1996) emphasizes that pragmatics studies the meaning conveyed by the speaker and interpreted by the listener. Thus, language does not merely describe reality but also functions as a tool for action, conveying intentions and influencing others. Recent research has extended this perspective by modeling how speakers and listeners infer contextually appropriate meanings. For instance, Jacob, Farina, and Andreas (2023) present a model where utterance-meaning mappings are guided by contextual reasoning, achieving predictions that align closely with human judgments. This underscores that pragmatic meaning arises from both linguistic knowledge and the interpretation of context and intentions.

In this context, speech act theory, developed by J. L. Austin and J. R. Searle, demonstrates that language is not only a vehicle for conveying information but also a form of social action. Austin (1962) identifies three levels of speech acts: the locutionary act, which involves producing a statement with literal meaning; the illocutionary act, reflecting the speaker's intended function or purpose; and the perlocutionary act, denoting the effect or response that the utterance produces in the listener. These three levels are interrelated and form a unified process in communication, where utterances do not simply transmit messages but enact social actions. Expanding on this, Tomasello (2023) emphasizes that speech acts are embedded in social and cognitive contexts that shape how utterances are interpreted, including action sequences, structural commitments, and social norms governing listener interpretation. Thus, integrating the perspectives of Austin, Searle, and Tomasello shows that understanding language requires both recognizing the speaker's intentions and considering the broader social and cognitive context in which communication occurs.

Searle (1969) then expanded the framework of Austin's theory by classifying speech acts based on social function and speaker intention into five main categories. First, assertive speech acts are speech that serves to state or describe something according to the speaker's beliefs, such as stating facts, claiming, reporting, or concluding; for example, "Today is very hot." Second, directive speech acts are speech that aims to influence the listener's actions to do something, such as giving orders, asking, advising, or suggesting; for example, "Please close the door." Third, commissive speech acts indicate the speaker's commitment to take action in the future, such as promising, swearing, or offering; for example, "I will come tomorrow." Fourth, expressive speech acts are used to express the speaker's feelings or attitudes towards a situation, such as thanking, apologizing, or complaining; for example, "I am very happy today." Fifth, declarative speech acts are speech that can change social circumstances through speech, such as in official statements or ceremonies; for example, "I declare you husband and wife."

That classification explains the performative power of an utterance based on its social function and the speaker's intention in interaction. Searle emphasizes that every utterance carries a particular intention and social force, so language does not merely convey meaning but also performs real actions in everyday communication.

This perspective has been applied in contemporary research, including the analysis of speech acts in films, to examine how language shapes social interaction and emotional expression. In the context of film, illocutionary acts play a role in constructing interpersonal dynamics, emotional tension, and cultural values in interactions among characters (Rofiah, Rosita & Pancarrani, 2025). For example, the analysis of directive and expressive speech acts shows how human interaction achieves coherence and social understanding.

Previous studies have applied speech act theory in various communication contexts. Permana and Mauriyat (2021), in their study titled "Analysis of Speech Acts in

Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's Political Speeches", found that assertive, directive, and commissive acts were the most dominant types, reflecting persuasive and authoritative functions in political communication. Pratiwi (2022) analyzed illocutionary acts in everyday conversations among university students and found that informal contexts were dominated by expressive and directive acts, highlighting emotional expression and interpersonal relationships.

Specifically in films, speech act theory has also been used to understand interactions between characters. Sari and Rachman (2020) studied the script of *Frozen II* and found that expressive and directive acts dominated dialogues that conveyed emotions and instructions among characters. Nugraha and Dewi (2023), analyzing *Spider-Man: No Way Home*, showed that speech acts play an important role in building character identity, conflict, and emotional relationships. Meanwhile, Putri (2021) highlighted the role of perlocutionary acts in films, which influence the audience's emotions and engagement with the storyline. These studies demonstrate that films, although scripted, still represent natural communication patterns and serve as a rich source of data for understanding pragmatic functions in human interaction.

Nevertheless, studies on speech acts in films have been limited to certain types, such as expressive and directive acts, or have focused only on the perlocutionary aspect. Few studies comprehensively analyze the relationship between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts in a single film, particularly with reference to Searle's (1969) classification. Therefore, research on speech acts in contemporary film dialogues remains limited.

Film is an interesting medium because it combines emotional, social, and linguistic dimensions. It demonstrates natural communication within a structured discourse, where language is used to convey meaning and perform social actions. As noted by Shehab (2023), "Film is a powerful ideological instrument to disseminate the dominant system of thought with its form, narrative and representation. Film plays a major role in aligning the spectators". This statement emphasizes that film not only tells a story but also serves as a vehicle to convey ideas, social values, and influence audience perception. Henry Johnson (2025) was chosen as the object of this study because it portrays character interactions built through emotionally charged dialogues and high-pressure situations. The protagonist's journey through personal and social challenges generates various types of utterances, from expressions of feelings and requests to responses to other characters' actions, providing an appropriate context to analyze how language is used to convey intent, build relationships, and create specific effects in interaction.

Based on this research gap, this study focuses on analyzing the types of speech acts found in Henry Johnson (2025) using Searle's (1969) classification. The aim is to identify how characters use language to express emotions, convey intentions, and establish interpersonal relationships through dialogue. By analyzing assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative acts, this study seeks to interpret the pragmatic meaning and communicative function underlying each utterance. The results are expected to contribute to a deeper understanding of the performative and social nature of informal communication and demonstrate how language in film reflects the dynamic interaction between meaning, action, and emotion in human communication.

Method

The study uses qualitative descriptive research to present and explain the use of language in its original environment. According to Kim, Sefcik, and Bradway (2017, as cited in PMC, 2020), qualitative descriptive studies focus on low-inference description,

which increases the likelihood of agreement among multiple researchers. This approach is appropriate for examining how speech acts are performed through dialogue, as it enables a detailed understanding of meaning, intention, and interaction in communication.

The data source consists of dialogues from the movie Henry Johnson (2025), which was preferred due to its capacity to reflect real-life conversations. The researcher acts as the instrument involved in data collection and analysis. The data collection process entailed repeated viewing of the movie and the transcribing of dialogues to identify those that involve speech acts according to Searle's (1969) classification as assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative speech acts. Further analysis was carried out on the identified dialogues to reflect action in terms of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts according to Austin (1962).

In the data analysis process, the researcher classified the identified speech acts and interpreted them on the basis of the type and context in which these are spoken. The aim of the interpretation was to understand the pragmatically intended meaning behind each speech act as expressed in terms of feelings and intentions conveyed in the movie. To ensure validity and reliability in the process of data analysis, contextual verification and discussion with colleagues was carried out to eliminate any personal constructs that might be present.

Results

In this section, the researcher presents speech data originating from conversations between Henry and the officers, both during the negotiation process at the scene and when Henry was in the detention room. Each data was selected based on its relevance to the speech act category analyzed using the theoretical framework of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). Data presentation is carried out sequentially and systematically to facilitate the interpretation process and provide a comprehensive picture of the speech dynamics that occur in the interaction.

Table 1. This distribution of locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary Speech Act

No	Type of Speech Acts		Frequency
1.	Locutionary		592
2.	Illocutionary	Assertive	281
		Directive	127
		Commissive	35
		Expressive	100
		Declarative	10
3.	Perlocutionary		298

Based on the results of the data calculations, the type of speech act that appears most frequently in the film Henry Johnson are assertive (281 data or 48%), followed by directive (127 data or 22%), expressive (100 data or 17%), commissive (35 data or 6%),

and declarative (10 data or 2%). Assertive dominance shows that most of the conversations in the film function to convey information, describe situations, and confirm the characters beliefs, especially in the tense scenes when Henry and other characters try to understand each other's situation by conveying facts or opinions. The existence of directives as the second most common type reflects the large number of instructions, demands and directions that emerge in the midst of crisis conditions, while expressiveness is present significantly because many dialogues display fear, confusion, regret, and emotional distress. Commissives appear less frequently because only a small proportion of conversations contain promises or commitments, whereas declaratives are the ones that appear least often because changes in status or official actions only occur in certain contexts. Overall, this pattern suggests that Henry Johnson's films rely heavily on intense exchanges of information to build plot, tension, and dynamics of relationships between characters.

Discussion

Example 1

Henry: "They'll kill me."

Pritchard: "They'll want to."

During this conversation, Henry is in a state of panic and feels attacked from all sides. He is holding a weapon and is suspicious of anyone who approaches him. Pritchard tries to approach him not as a threat, but as someone who wants to calm the situation. Tensions are still very high, and trust has not yet been established.

- Locutionary Act: In locutionary , Henry says "They'll kill me," which literally conveys the information that he believes someone wants to kill him. Pritchard's utterance "They'll want to" conveys the literal meaning of agreement with Henry's claim. Both utterances, on the surface, contain a direct description of the threat and the speakers' beliefs about the dangerous situation.
- Illocutionary Act: At the illocutionary level, Henry is essentially asserting fear; he affirms the perception of danger as a subjective reality that underlies his actions. The sentence "They'll kill me" not only conveys information but also provides psychological justification for maintaining vigilance and not discharging weapons. Meanwhile, Pritchard's illocutionary act, "They'll want to," is affirmative reassurance; he doesn't denigrate or intimidate, but rather demonstrates that he understands Henry's fears. He seeks to build closeness through emotional validation: confirming Henry's fears to open communication.
- Perlocutionary Act: The perlocutionary effect of this utterance is the creation of a sense of Pritchard's understanding of Henry's situation. When Pritchard affirms "They'll want to," he creates an emotional effect of a shared perception of danger, preventing Henry from feeling overly or irrationally threatened. Although his fear doesn't diminish, it does make Henry more willing to listen to Pritchard than before, a crucial step in opening the way for further dialogue and indirectly fostering the potential for cooperation.

Example 2

*Pritchard: "You have to give me the g*n, Henry."*

*Pritchard: "Button drops the magazine. Then you can give me the g*n."*

In a tense hostage situation, Pritchard attempts to take control verbally. He attempts to de-escalate the conflict while still directing Henry to drop his weapon. Henry's emotional state is unstable, so Pritchard chooses verbal expressions that sound rational and measured.

- Locutionary act: At the locutionary level, Pritchard utters the sentence, "You have to give me the gun, Henry. Button drops the magazine. Then you can give me the gun." This utterance literally contains a procedural instruction directing Henry to perform a technical action: removing the magazine and handing over his weapon.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "You have to give me the gun, Henry" functions as a directive speech act aimed at commanding and controlling the situation by establishing a false sense of security. By adding "Button drops the magazine. Then you can give me the gun," Pritchard intends to reassure Henry that he still has control over the process, so that Henry is willing to hand over his weapon without feeling a loss of dominance. Thus, the illocutionary act is subtle persuasion through technical instructions to defuse the threat.
- Perlocutionary act: At the perlocutionary level, the utterance "You have to give me the gun, Henry" impacts Henry's emotional instability because the instruction forces him to confront the reality of possible loss of control. Henry's reaction indicates that the utterance provokes suspicion and resistance, not compliance. While the "Then you can give me the gun" part is expected to elicit a response of surrendering the gun, the actual perlocutionary act actually escalates the situation because Henry feels cornered.

Example 3

Henry: "Will you protect me from them?"

Pritchard: "I told you I would."

Pritchard: "That's my job."

When Henry expresses distrust and refuses to surrender his gun, Pritchard attempts to deflect Henry's emotional response by emphasizing his professionalism and expertise related to the rescue task. He uses declarative statements to establish credibility.

- Locutionary act: Locutionary, Pritchard says, "I told you I would. That's my job." The literal meaning of this utterance is an affirmation that he has previously stated his intention and that rescue is his duty.
- Illocutionary act: At the illocutionary level, the statement "I told you I would. That's my job" aims to strengthen Henry's trust in Pritchard's abilities. Through this utterance, Pritchard presents himself as a professional who can handle the situation, so Henry feels safe enough to lower his guard. The illocutionary function is to establish authority and credibility so that Henry will follow further instructions.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "I told you I would. That's my job" influences Henry's response to consider his trust in Pritchard, although it does not completely dampen his emotions. The utterance produces a momentary

reflection effect, but it is not strong enough to change Henry's decision to surrender the weapon immediately.

Example 4

Henry: "I'm afraid you'll shoot me."

Henry: "I don't want to die."

Pritchard sees Henry again doubting his intentions, so he tries to tap into Henry's emotional side to create a sense of interpersonal connection. He uses a personal relationship frame to weaken resistance.

- Locutionary act: At the locutionary level, Pritchard says, "I'm your friend, Henry. I'm here to help you." The literal meaning is a declaration of friendship and an intention to help.
- Illocutionary act: At the illocutionary level, the statement "I'm your friend, Henry" is used as an expressive speech act aimed at creating emotional closeness. Likewise, "I'm here to help you" contains the illocutionary function of reassurance, namely calming and reaffirming that his presence is not a threat. The illocutionary function is to persuade through emotional closeness, not technical instructions.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "I'm your friend, Henry. I'm here to help you" creates a moment of doubt in Henry: he tries to assess whether Pritchard is truly a friend or a manipulative person. The effect isn't to immediately make Henry give up, but the utterance disrupts Henry's mental defenses by evoking sentimental emotions.

Example 5

Henry: "She cried when I told her."

Henry: "She wanted to hear my story."

At this stage, Henry begins to become emotional and defensive again. Pritchard uses the strategy of sharing feelings to demonstrate empathy. He no longer appears dominant but instead becomes a figure who understands Henry's pain.

- Locutionary act: At the locutionary level, Pritchard says, "I know you're hurting. This isn't who you are." The literal meaning is an acknowledgment that Henry is hurt and that his actions don't reflect his true self.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "I know you're hurting" aims to validate Henry's emotions, while "This isn't who you are" attempts to restore Henry's positive moral identity, so he feels he's still a "good person" capable of acting correctly. The illocutionary goal is to reduce destructive guilt and encourage Henry to make rational choices.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "I know you're hurting. This isn't who you are" weakens Henry's anger and allows him to react emotionally, rather than offensively. The effect is to foster vulnerability and internalize the message

that he is not, in fact, the perpetrator of the violence, opening the possibility for further negotiation without aggression.

Example 6

Pritchard: "You know how this ends if you keep pointing that gun."

Henry: "I just want them to hear me."

After Henry shows signs of emotional vulnerability, Pritchard sees an opportunity to direct Henry's decision to stop his actions. Instead of commanding, he uses a reflective approach to get Henry to see the consequences of his own actions.

- Locutionary act: At the locutionary level, Pritchard says, "You don't want to do this, Henry." Literally, this utterance implies that the action Henry is about to take is not something he truly wants.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "You don't want to do this, Henry" is an indirect directive speech act that aims to stop a dangerous action without sounding like a command. Behind this utterance, Pritchard intends to instill doubt in Henry about his decision, causing him to reconsider what will happen if he continues with his actions.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "You don't want to do this, Henry" makes Henry pause for thought, implicitly forcing him to ask himself whether his actions are truly his own desires or merely a momentary emotional response. The effect is an emotional pause that halts the aggressive impulse.

Example 7

Pritchard: "Put the gun down, Henry."

Officer: "Step away from the window!"

Seeing Henry's emotional pause, Pritchard continues by creating a vision of the future. This is not about the present, but about the final outcome of Henry's actions if he does not stop.

- Locutionary act: At the locutionary level, Pritchard states, "You don't want to hurt anyone." Literally, this sentence states that Henry does not want to hurt anyone.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, by saying "You don't want to hurt anyone," Pritchard wants to reassure Henry that his personality is not one of harm. He uses an expressive speech act that affirms Henry's moral identity, encouraging him to refrain from violent acts. The illocutionary goal is to rebuild a positive self-image as a basis for behavioral change.
- Perlocutionary act: The perlocutionary effect of the utterance "You don't want to hurt anyone" is to evoke feelings of guilt and self-reflection in Henry. These words touch Henry's moral side, previously suppressed by intense emotions, causing him to become more passive and less aggressive.

Example 8

Pritchard: "I'll make sure you're safe, but you have to trust me."

Henry: "Promise you won't let them shoot."

To strengthen the emotional impact, Pritchard connects Henry's actions to broader consequences, not just for himself. She wants to make Henry think about the relationships and lives of the people he loves.

- Locutionary act: Locutionary, Pritchard says, "Think about your family." The literal meaning is asking Henry to consider his family before making a decision.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the statement "Think about your family" is a directive speech act that directs Henry to consider his emotional relationships and responsibilities. Pritchard intends to evoke Henry's empathy for those who will be affected by his actions.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the statement "Think about your family" causes emotional turmoil in Henry because he realizes that his actions are destroying not only himself but also his family's future. The effect is to increase Henry's ambivalence, which slows his tendency to make aggressive decisions.

Example 9

Henry: "I didn't mean for any of this to happen."

Pritchard: "I know you're scared."

When Henry begins to remember his family, Pritchard uses the moment to affirm Henry's humanity and remove the criminal label that has been covering him.

- Locutionary act: At the locutionary level, Pritchard states, "You're a good man, Henry." Literally, this utterance conveys the assessment that Henry is a good man.
- Illocutionary act: At the illocutionary level, the utterance "You're a good man, Henry" functions as affirmative praise aimed at restoring Henry's positive self-identity. Through this sentence, Pritchard intends to convey that surrender is not defeat, but the right action because he is a good person who should not resort to violence.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "You're a good man, Henry" erodes Henry's anger and replaces it with compassion and regret. He no longer reacts with aggression, but with emotional calm, because the statement touches on the deepest part of his self-worth.

Example 10

Pritchard: "You're under arrest, Henry."

At this stage, Pritchard believes Henry's resistance is about to break down. He shifts his approach from emotional persuasion to encouraging a final decision.

- Locutionary act: At the locutionary level, Pritchard says, "It's not too late." Literally, he's telling Henry that there's still time to improve the situation.

- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "It's not too late" is a speech act that offers hope and new options. Pritchard's intention is to convey that giving up doesn't mean everything is lost, but rather that there's still a chance to improve one's life.
- Perlocutionary act: The perlocutionary effect of the utterance "It's not too late" is to create a sense of relief and hope in Henry. He sees the possibility of survival and improvement, making him more emotionally stable and more open to negotiation.

Example 11

Henry: "I really was just trying to protect everyone."

Pritchard: "I understand, Henry. I know your intentions were good."

At this point, Pritchard gently encourages a final decision, using language that isn't pushy but full of encouragement.

- Locutionary act: Locutionary, he says, "Just put the gun down." This is literally a request to put down the weapon.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the statement "Just put the gun down" remains a directive, but Pritchard uses the word "just" to make it sound simple, non-threatening, and non-threatening. His illocutionary purpose is not to command, but to invite Henry to make a safe decision.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "Just put the gun down" encourages Henry to consider the physical act of surrendering the weapon as simple and possible without loss of self-respect, thus weakening his resistance.

Example 12

Henry: "I think I just made everything worse."

Pritchard: "It's okay to feel that way. We'll handle this together."

Pritchard begins his closing persuasion by reaffirming his emotional resolve to help Henry, so that he feels less alone.

- Locutionary act: Pritchard says, "I'm right here with you." The literal meaning is that he is by Henry's side physically and emotionally.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "I'm right here with you" is an assurance of emotional closeness and loyalty. Pritchard intends to dispel Henry's feelings of isolation and fear, demonstrating that he will not go through the process of surrender alone.
- Perlocutionary act: The perlocutionary effect of "I'm right here with you" is to increase Henry's sense of security and trust. These words soothe his psychological distress and strengthen his decision to lay down his weapon.

Example 13

Henry: "I didn't realize how much I hurt you."

Pritchard: "Thank you for admitting that."

As Henry becomes more resigned, Pritchard reinforces his assurance that surrender is the right and not shameful choice.

- Locutionary act: Locutionary, Pritchard says, "You're doing the right thing." The literal meaning is that Henry's surrender is the right thing.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "You're doing the right thing" aims to provide moral validation and prevent Henry from hesitating or returning to destructive thoughts. Pritchard wants to ensure Henry continues the process of surrender without being provoked by emotions.
- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "You're doing the right thing" provides emotional stability for Henry. He becomes steadfast and stops considering further violence.

Example 14

Henry: "I feel really lost right now."

Pritchard: "You're not alone. I'm here with you."

When Henry is on the verge of surrendering his gun, Pritchard offers a final push in a gentle and highly personal manner.

- Locutionary act: Locutionary, Pritchard says, "Give me the gun, Henry." This sentence literally asks Henry to give his gun to Pritchard.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "Give me the gun, Henry" is a final directive. Pritchard intends to end the situation safely without aggressively pressuring Henry, but rather through Henry's trust and free will.
- Perlocutionary act: The perlocutionary effect of the utterance "Give me the gun, Henry" is Henry's physical action of slowly handing over the gun because he believes that surrender is the best option and will not hurt him.

Example 15

Henry: "I just wish I could undo everything."

Pritchard: "I know. Regret is something we all feel at times."

As the weapon is about to change hands, Pritchard concludes the persuasion process with an emotionally binding affirmation, not a command, but rather an affirmation of Henry's moral reason to surrender.

- Locutionary act: Locutionary, Pritchard says, "You're safe now." The literal meaning is that Henry is now safe.
- Illocutionary act: Illocutionary, the utterance "You're safe now" affirms a sense of psychological and physical safety. Pritchard intends to assure Henry that he is no

longer under any external or internal threat, thus there is no reason to revert to violence.

- Perlocutionary act: Perlocutionary, the utterance "You're safe now" creates a complete emotional release in Henry: physical and psychological tension subsides, he surrenders the weapon in resignation, and the crisis ends without violence.

Overall, this study identified a number of speech data that are relevant to be analyzed based on speech act theory. However, we only present 15 data which are considered as the most representative to describe the variation in speech acts that emerged in the interactions between Henry and the officers. The selection of this number is based on the consideration that the data presented is sufficient for the analysis needs and is able to provide a comprehensive picture of the dynamics of communication in the context of the events being studied.

Conclusion

In Conclusion this research explores the use of speech acts found in the movie entitled *Henry Johnson* (2025), applying the theories from the works of J.L. Austin (1962) and John R. Searle (1969). The findings indicate that expressive and directive speech acts are the most frequently found within emotionally charged and pressuring situations. The speech acts are shown to involve fear and remorse reactions, as well as action-guiding functions. The results also indicate that commissive speech acts are found to facilitate the process of negotiation and trust establishment among characters. In comprehending the findings made by this study, it can be seen that the application of locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act highlights the use of dialogue processes that shape character psychology and establish the storyline in any cinematic production. The pragmatics study adds to the development of pragmatics research by applying cinematic scenarios to gain an extensive understanding about the use of linguistic functions that produce social action.

References

- Aryanto, T. N., & Sitorus, F. K. (2025). Kajian Teori Komunikasi Jurgen Habermas: Pondasi Rasionalitas Dalam Interaksi Sosial. *Nivedana: Jurnal Komunikasi dan Bahasa*, 6(2), 370–382. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53565/nivedana.v6i2.1755>
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*.
- Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press.
- Jacob, M., Farina, M., & Andreas, J. (2023). Regularized Conventions: Equilibrium Computation as a Model of Pragmatic Reasoning. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.09712>
- Kim, H., Sefcik, J. S., & Bradway, C. (2017). Characteristics of qualitative descriptive studies: A systematic review. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 40(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.21768>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Nugraha, B., & Dewi, F. (2023). Speech acts in *Spider-Man: No Way Home*: A pragmatic analysis. *Journal of English Language and Literature*, 12(2), 98–105. <https://doi.org/10.33884/jell.v12i2.2527>

- Pratiwi, D. (2022). Illocutionary acts in everyday conversations among university students. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*, 9(3), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.36565/jibs.v9i3.1573>
- Permana, R., & Mauriyat, I. (2021). Analysis of speech acts in Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's political speeches. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 6(1), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.30870/jels.v6i1.12001>
- Putri, A. (2021). The role of perlocutionary acts in influencing audience emotions in film dialogues. *Linguistic Studies Journal*, 4(2), 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ljs.v4i2.2224>
- Rofiah, L. N., Rosita, F. Y., & Pancarrani, B. (2025). Analisis tindak tutur ilokusi dalam film *Komang karya Naya Anindita*. *BLAZE: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra dalam Pendidikan Linguistik dan Pengembangan*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.59841/blaze.v3i2.2675>
- Sari, M., & Rachman, A. (2020). An analysis of speech acts in the *Frozen II* movie script. *Linguistic and Literary Studies Journal*, 3(1), 50–58. <https://doi.org/10.33369/llsj.v3i1.1834>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shehab, Asmaa. (2023). Film as a Tool of Ideology. *هرمس (Hermes)*, Vol. 12, Issue 1, pp. 31–63. DOI: 10.21608/herms.2023.354093.
- Tomasello, R. (2023). Linguistic signs in action: The neuropragmatics of speech acts. *Frontiers in Psychology*. PMC9856589
- Transkrip film Henry Johnson (2025). <https://transcripts.foreverdreaming.org/viewtopic.php?t=207239>
- Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language* (8th ed.). Cambridge University Press.