CULTURA FRANCA

CULTURA FRANCA JOURNAL
Vol 1, No 2,2025, pp 89-99
eISSN: 2828-5869.

THE ILLOCUTIONARY SPEECH ACTS OF SOCIAL FACTORS IN *IMPERFECT THE SERIES 2* (SOCIOPRAGMATIC)

Ivan Yuliyanto
Institut Prima Bangsa Cirebon
ivanyuliyanto07@gmail.com

Accepted: Oktober 03, 2025;

Revised: October 24, 2025;

Approved: November 17, 2025.

Abstract:

This study examines illocutionary speech acts influenced by social factors in *Imperfect: The Series 2* through a sociopragmatic approach. The analysis focuses on how occupation, social class, education, age, and gender shape the use of speech acts. Using a qualitative descriptive method and purposive sampling, selected dialogues were transcribed and analyzed based on Searle's (1979) classification of illocutionary acts and Wardhaugh's (2006) theory of social factor, supported by Brown and Levinson's (1987) and Leech's (1983) politeness frameworks. The findings reveal that each social factor significantly influences language use: occupation determines register and formality, social class affects directness, education influences lexical choice and code switching, age shapes illocutionary preferences, and gender affects politeness orientation. Cultural norms also play a role, with Jakarta/Betawi slang signaling solidarity, Sundanese politeness emphasizing harmony, and Papuan straightforwardness reflected in direct speech. This study concludes that illocutionary acts in media discourse are socially and culturally situated, reflecting Indonesia's sociolinguistic diversity. The results contribute to sociopragmatic studies and provide practical insights for language education, media scriptwriting, and future research on language and identity.

Keywords: sociopragmatics, illocutionary acts, social factors, language variation, *Imperfect The Series 2*

INTRODUCTION

Language is not merely a neutral medium of communication, but also a dynamic social practice that both reflects and shapes human interactions. As Wardhaugh and Fuller (2021) argue, language is deeply embedded in social life; it encodes values, identities, ideologies, and cultural norms, while at the same time serving as a tool for constructing and negotiating social relationships. Language therefore is not static but varies according to context, speaker, interlocutor, and communicative purpose. This variation becomes a central concern of sociolinguistics, a field of study that examines the relationship between language and society.

Sociolinguists consistently emphasize that factors such as age, gender, social class, education, and occupation influence the way individuals use and interpret language, shaping both their linguistic repertoire and their communicative style.

One of the most important dimensions of language use is its ability to perform actions. This perspective is foregrounded by speech act theory, particularly the work of Austin (1962) and Searle (1979), who introduced the concept of illocutionary acts. According to Searle, every utterance not only conveys information (locutionary) but also performs a social function (illocutionary), such as asserting, requesting, promising, expressing, or declaring. These functions are central to communication because they reveal what speakers are doing with words and how listeners interpret these actions within a given context. Crucially, the performance of illocutionary acts is not isolated from social reality but shaped by cultural norms, interpersonal relationships, and power dynamics.

The integration of sociolinguistic and pragmatic perspectives is known as sociopragmatics. Leech (1983) describes sociopragmatics as the sociological interface of pragmatics, focusing on how social variables affect the use and interpretation of language. Unlike pragmalinguistics, which is concerned with the linguistic forms available for performing speech acts, sociopragmatics deals with the social rules of appropriateness that guide speakers' choices. For example, the same request may be expressed directly among close friends but more indirectly when directed toward a superior. Politeness theory, particularly Brown and Levinson's (1987) model, further demonstrates how strategies of face saving and face-threatening are influenced by power, distance, and imposition. Thus, sociopragmatics provides a valuable framework for examining how speech acts are realized differently depending on social context and cultural expectations.

The urgency of this study lies in the limited research that applies a sociopragmatic lens to Indonesian media, particularly television and film. Indonesia is a country with rich linguistic diversity, encompassing hundreds of regional languages and dialects alongside Bahasa Indonesia as the national language. This diversity manifests not only in everyday communication but also in media representations. Popular films and television series often depict characters from different social classes, ethnic backgrounds, and age groups, whose speech reflects real-world sociolinguistic variation. However, most existing studies either focus on sociolinguistic variation alone analyzing dialects, sociolects, or code switching or on pragmatic functions such as politeness or illocutionary acts in isolation. Few studies integrate the two perspectives to analyze how speech acts are shaped by social factors within Indonesian media discourse.

Previous research highlights both the potential and the limitations of current approaches. For instance, Wati (2015) examined style variation in the film *Snow White and the Huntsman* by applying Joos' (1967) speech style theory and Holmes' (1992) sociolinguistic framework. The study showed how different characters employed casual, formal, and consultative styles depending on the interlocutor and context, thereby supporting the view that social relationships influence linguistic style. Similarly, Astuti (2020) analyzed the Indonesian drama *Layangan Putus* using Wardhaugh and Fuller's (2021) framework, demonstrating how language varied according to social class, gender, and occupation. Characters from higher social classes tended to use more formal and grammatically accurate expressions, while those from lower classes employed informal and colloquial language. This supports the argument that language is a reflection of social identity and status.

Research focusing more directly on pragmatics also offers relevant insights. Rahmawati et al. (2024) investigated illocutionary acts in food review videos on YouTube, applying Searle's

classification. Their findings revealed that younger speakers were more likely to use expressive and informal utterances, while older speakers preferred conventional and polite forms. This confirms that age is a significant factor shaping speech act preferences. Likewise, Rejeki and Afnita (2023) explored linguistic variation on Instagram comments, emphasizing that social factors such as age, social status, and discussion topics influenced language use, with informal forms dominating online interactions. Another study by Solehati et al. (2022) examined Madurese speakers' language on social media, highlighting the interplay between formality, context, and audience. These studies confirm the influence of social variables on linguistic choices, yet they are largely limited to digital communication platforms.

From this review, it becomes clear that a gap remains in analyzing sociopragmatic variation within Indonesian television or film. Media such as *Imperfect: The Series 2* serve as fertile ground for such research because they portray characters from diverse backgrounds in everyday situations that mirror Indonesian society. The series features interactions among characters of different ages, genders, educational backgrounds, occupations, and social classes, providing rich material for examining both social variation and speech acts. Moreover, the series incorporates authentic linguistic features such as Jakarta slang, Sundanese politeness strategies, and Papuan directness, reflecting the heterogeneity of Indonesian speech styles. Studying how these variations influence illocutionary acts can thus contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of Indonesian sociopragmatics.

This research integrates Wardhaugh and Fuller's (2006, 2021) theory of social factors with Searle's (1979) speech act theory. Wardhaugh and Fuller highlight how age, gender, occupation, education, and social class shape linguistic behavior—where age influences speech style, gender affects communicative patterns, occupation determines professional registers, education enhances lexical range, and social class dictates formality. Searle's framework classifies speech acts into assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives, which are used to analyze how characters in *Imperfect: The Series 2* perform language acts influenced by their social background. Each social factor affects the way these illocutionary acts are expressed, reflecting variations in politeness, authority, and communicative style.

This research is significant because it demonstrates how sociopragmatics can be applied to media discourse, offering insights into both linguistic practice and cultural representation. By analyzing *Imperfect: The Series 2*, the study illustrates how Indonesian media portrays the intersection of social identity and speech acts, highlighting the role of cultural norms such as Jakarta and Betawi slang for in-group solidarity, Sundanese politeness for harmony and respect, and Papuan directness for straightforwardness. These cultural nuances enrich the understanding of how speech acts are embedded within broader sociocultural systems. In sum, this study addresses the gap in sociopragmatic research on Indonesian media by combining social factor theory and speech act theory to reveal how language reflects and constructs social realities in contemporary television narratives.

In sum, this study addresses the gap in sociopragmatic research on Indonesian media by analyzing the illocutionary acts of social factors in *Imperfect: The Series 2*. It underscores the need to consider both social variation and pragmatic function in understanding how language operates in media discourse. Ultimately, it demonstrates that illocutionary acts are not only linguistic forms but also socially and culturally situated practices, reflecting Indonesia's rich sociolinguistic diversity.

The objectives of this research are twofold: first, to identify and classify the types of illocutionary acts in *Imperfect: The Series 2* based on Searle's framework; second, to analyze

how social factors such as age, gender, education, occupation, and social class influence the realization of these speech acts. By pursuing these objectives, the study not only contributes to sociopragmatics in the Indonesian context but also offers practical implications for education, media, and cultural studies. For linguistics students and researchers, it provides a model for integrating sociolinguistic and pragmatic analysis. For screenwriters and media practitioners, it offers insights into how authentic dialogue can reflect social and cultural realities. For educators and language learners, it raises awareness of how social background affects pragmatic competence in communication.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach in order to explore the relationship between social factors and illocutionary acts in the dialogues of *Imperfect: The Series 2*. A qualitative method was considered appropriate because the focus of the research is not on numerical measurement but on understanding meanings, social dynamics, and the pragmatic functions of language within its natural context. As Ary et al. (2020) note, qualitative research emphasizes the exploration of phenomena as they are experienced by individuals, while Flick (2021) underlines the importance of analyzing data in their social and cultural settings.

The data of this research consisted of selected dialogues from *Imperfect: The Series 2*. The series was chosen purposively because it portrays a variety of characters representing different age groups, genders, educational backgrounds, occupations, and social classes, thereby providing rich examples of language variation and speech acts. The population of the study is the entirety of dialogues in the series, while the sample consists of utterances that explicitly display illocutionary acts and reflect social variation. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling, which allows the researcher to select data based on their relevance to the research objectives. Dialogues were chosen specifically because they illustrate either one of Searle's (1979) categories of illocutionary acts assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives or one of Wardhaugh and Fuller's (2006, 2021) social factors such as age, gender, education, occupation, or social class.

The data collection was carried out using content analysis techniques. Each selected episode was viewed carefully, and relevant dialogues were transcribed in full, including linguistic markers such as slang, dialect, and code-switching. This transcription process ensured that both linguistic and contextual elements were preserved for analysis. Once transcribed, the dialogues were organized into categories of illocutionary acts and social factors. In addition, contextual information such as speaker identity, relationship, and situational background was recorded to enable a more accurate interpretation of the speech acts.

In terms of instruments, the researcher relied primarily on observation sheets and categorization tables developed from the theoretical framework. These instruments functioned as analytical guides for classifying utterances according to illocutionary categories and social variables. This systematic classification allowed the researcher to ensure consistency and transparency in the analysis process.

The data analysis followed Creswell and Poth's (2020) qualitative analysis procedures. First, the data were organized by grouping the transcribed dialogues according to categories of social variation and illocutionary acts. Second, each group was analyzed to determine how social factors influenced the use of particular speech acts. Third, the results were interpreted in relation to the theoretical framework of Searle (1979), Wardhaugh and Fuller (2006, 2021), and Leech (1983), in order to draw connections between linguistic practices, social background, and

pragmatic function. Finally, the findings were summarized and synthesized to highlight patterns of sociopragmatic variation in the series.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

According to Searle (1979), illocutionary acts can be classified into five main types based on their function in communication. These include: assertives**,** directives**,** commissives**,** expressives**,** and declaratives**.**

Table 1. Types and Frequency of Illocutionary Speech Acts

Types of Illocutionary Acts	Frequency	Percentage
Assertive	**6**	**20%**
Directive	**7**	**23%**
Commissive	**5**	**17%**
Expressive	**7**	**23%**
Declarative	**6**	**20%**
Total	**31**	**100%**

To illustrate the analysis more concretely, here are several resentative example from the data:
Data 1
Context: Neti and her friend are about to reveal or explain something important, possibly as a form of proof or narrative justification.
Dialogue:
Neti: “Kita mau **nunjukin** sesuatu…”

The word *nunjukin* is a colloquial form of ***menunjukkan*** (“to show”), which reflects informal youth Indonesian. The utterance introduces an intention to present proof or reveal something, signaling the speaker’s belief that what is about to be shown holds narrative or social importance. This is a **descriptive assertive**, where the speaker states their intention grounded in a factual or anticipated event. Assertives commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition (Searle, 1979). In this case, Neti conveys a sense of urgency and credibility, implying that the act of showing will support or validate a prior claim. In Jakarta’s urban youth culture, direct but casual announcements like this are part of solidarity-building communication. The lack of formal markers signals equality within the group, reinforcing *low power distance* interaction. As Holmes (2013) notes, solidarity strategies in such contexts rely on colloquial language to create closeness, even when the message is important. Neti’s phrasing reflects the metropolitan value of quick, efficient communication while maintaining an emotional connection, typical in peer-to-peer urban discourse.
Data 2
Context: Misel explains her Instagram content plan for the month, using a mix of English and Indonesian.
Dialogue:
Misel: “Konsep **feed** aku bulan ini tuh beauty inside and in out…”

The term ***feed*** is borrowed from Instagram, referring to the visual layout or thematic arrangement of posts. The expression *beauty inside and in out* is an adapted version of the common phrase *beauty inside and out*, likely stylized for emphasis or humor. Code-mixing (English-Indonesian) here reflects modern urban youth speech. The speaker explains the thematic concept of their social media content for the current month. The function is to justify why certain people or types of content are included or excluded from the feed. This is an **explanatory assertive**. The speaker provides reasoning behind a personal digital decision, demonstrating agency over her social media identity. In terms, this is a truth committing act that reflects the speaker's belief about their aesthetic or moral standards (Searle, 1979). Code-mixing in Jakarta is not just a linguistic habit but a cultural marker of cosmopolitanism and global connectivity. Urban youth often incorporate English into casual speech to signal modernity, trend-awareness, and affiliation with global pop culture. In sociopragmatic terms (Leech, 1983), this functions as *identity work*, where language choice reflects self presentation strategies linked to social media-driven lifestyles.

Data 3

Context: Prita is reminding or scolding someone for failing to understand an unspoken social rule or expectation.

Dialogue:

Prita: "**Lo** kan **harus** ngerti kan…"

The use of ***lo*** (you) and the modal ***harus*** (must) reflects informal imperative speech among peers. The repetition of *kan* functions as a pragmatic marker, emphasizing agreement or shared knowledge. The utterance places responsibility on the listener, implying that they should already understand a particular social or moral expectation likely related to behavior, popularity, or digital presence. This is an **evaluative assertive**, where the speaker makes a moral or social judgment. It functions as an indirect criticism or reminder. Rather than commanding, the speaker presents the expectation as a shared norm therefore asserting its truth or self-evidence. Evaluative statements qualify as assertives when they express the speaker's belief about someone's actions (Searle, 1979). Jakarta peer culture allows for relatively direct evaluation among equals, especially when norms are perceived as obvious. The informal pronoun *lo* and modal *harus* convey firmness without breaking solidarity. This reflects an urban conversational style that prioritizes clarity and frankness but tempers it with pragmatic particles like *kan* to maintain rapport (Holmes, 2013).

Table 2. Types and Frequency of Social Factors

Social Factors	Frequency	Percentage
Social Class	**5**	**20%**
Education	**5**	**20%**
Occupation	**7**	**28%**
Age	**5**	**20%**
Gender	**4**	**12%**
Total	**26**	**100%**

To illustrate the analysis more concretely, here are several resentative example from the data:

Data 1

Context: This conversation takes place late at night in a private setting, where Neti, a financially struggling woman who is out of work, calls her former colleague, Togar, who is currently working as a professional makeup artist at a celebrity photo shoot. Neti is trying to find a job and asks Togar for help in an informal and spontaneous way. The situation reflects an imbalance of power, as Togar is in a more stable, professional position while Neti is in a desperate and casual state.

Dialogue:

Neti : *"Hallo Togar **pao**."*
Togar: *"Ada pa nelpon jam segini?"*
Neti : *"Bagi pekerjaan lah, ngerias apa gitu loh."*
Togar: *"Ngerias jenazah mau? Enak diem ajah, ga banyak permintaan."*
Neti : *"**Gua** bilangin ke **bapa lu** yang tentara nih."*
Togar: *"Yaudah gini ajah, kamu kirim ajah porto mu nanti aku kasihkan ke klienku, bagaimana?"*
Neti : *"Gitu dong, mau yang 2x3 atau 3x4?"*
Togar: *"Porto loh, **portofolio, CV**, kirim CV."*
Neti : *"Oh CV, nanti ku kirim ya."*

The contrast in language use between Neti and Togar reveals their differing social class backgrounds. Neti frequently uses informal lexical items such as ***"gua"***, ***"pao"***, and ***"bapa lu"***, which are commonly associated with casual or street level speech. In more formal registers, these words would typically be replaced with ***"saya"***, ***"teman"*** **or a direct name**, and ***"ayah Anda"***. The use of such informal expressions indicates a speech style shaped by her lower socioeconomic status, where familiarity and spontaneity are prioritized over politeness and precision. Speakers from lower social classes often rely on colloquial forms that reflect everyday social realities (Holmes, 2013).

Togar, in contrast, speaks using formal and occupational terms such as *"**klien**"*, *"**portofolio**"*, and *"**CV**"*, demonstrating his engagement in a professional environment, this pattern of **an individual's occupation significantly influences their language**, particularly in the use of specialized vocabulary and formal registers appropriate to professional contexts (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2006). His structured sentence pattern and lexical choices indicate his higher social and occupational status. Meanwhile, speakers from lower social classes tend to use more general or informal equivalents, such as *"pelanggan"* instead of *"klien"*, *"pengalaman"* instead of *"portofolio"*, and *"biodata"* or *"daftar kerjaan"* in place of *"CV"*, individuals from higher social classes possess what is called *symbolic capital*, which includes the ability to use language that aligns with institutional and professional norms (Bourdieu, 1991). Togar speech not only communicates meaning but also reinforces his superior social position, while Neti's informal speech situates her as an outsider to professional culture. This exchange clearly illustrates how linguistic features serve to maintain and reflect social class boundaries.

Data 2

Context: This conversation occurs in a busy local food stall (warteg) during meal time. Prita, a young woman who frequently visits the stall, is attempting to place an order. The setting is crowded and informal, and Prita displays impatience due to the long wait. She also jokingly requests to pay her food later, suggesting familiarity with the stall owner.

Dialogue:

Prita : *"Pelayann, pelayan?"*
Ibu Warteg: *"Apaan?"*

Prita : *"Lama bener lu udah dipanggil-panggil dari tadi, ini mau mesen."*
Ibu Warteg : *"Mesen apa?"*
Prita : *"**Gua** mau mesen nasi sama ayam sama es teh-nya satu, tapi **bayarnya besok ya**, hehehe."*

Prita's speech exhibits informal and direct language that aligns with working class communication patterns. The use of personal pronouns such as *"**gua**"* and *"**lu**"* as well as the direct manner in which she speaks, reflects a communicative style that prioritizes clarity and efficiency over politeness. This pragmatic approach is typical in lower socioeconomic settings where transactional interactions are common and social hierarchy is minimized. In contrast, individuals from higher social classes tend to use more refined and formal personal pronouns such as *"**saya**"* and *"**Anda**"*, which signify politeness, respect, and social distance (Holmes, 2013). The casual joke about postponing payment ("**bayarnya besok ya**") suggests a form of social negotiation that is normalized within informal economic spaces such as food stalls. Therefore, Prita's linguistic choices not only reflect her social class, but also align with the conversational norms of her environment.

Data 3

Context: This scene takes place in the communal living area of a boarding house (rumah kos) during the day. Tante Ratna, the landlady and a figure of authority, enters the space to inform the tenants that a new boarder will arrive the following day. She encourages the tenants, including Neti, to behave properly and set a good example. Neti jokingly responds to Ratna's warning, but suddenly curses emotionally after being bitten by an ant. The setting is domestic, but socially hierarchical, where Tante Ratna acts as a regulator of conduct.

Dialogue:

Tante Ratna: *"Besok ada anak kos baru, jadi kamu sama teman-teman harus jadi contoh yang bener, jangan jorok, jangan ngomong kasar."*
Neti : *"Ya Tante, mana pernah sih saya ngomong kasar yaelah**, eh monyet**."*
Tante Ratna: *"Ahhh ada apa Neti?"*
Neti : *"Ini kegigit semut rangrang."*
Tante Ratna: *"Makanya jangan ngangkang duduknya."*

In this interaction, Tante Ratna's speech reflects her middle class background, as she emphasizes discipline, cleanliness, and proper behavior. Her use of imperative sentences and corrective tone serves as a moral directive, aiming to instill class based values such as decorum and modesty. Neti, however, responds with emotionally charged and spontaneous language. Her use of the expletive ***"eh monyet"*** in response to pain illustrates a lower degree of self-monitoring and restraint, associate with speakers from informal social backgrounds (Chaer & Agustin, 2010). Furthermore, her relaxed body posture and reactive speech contrast sharply with Tante Ratna's controlled and value-laden communication, revealing a class-based difference in both verbal and nonverbal behavior. This scene exemplifies how language serves not only to express personal attitudes but also to enforce social norms. Ratna's role as a figure of authority allows her to use language as a disciplinary tool, while Neti's speech reflects the norms of her own social sphere.

This interaction reveals emotionally charged communication between two female characters. Endah, feeling wronged, expresses her frustration using emotive language and justification. Her use of the phrase ***gimana saya nggak sebel?*** shows that her emotional reaction is based on a perceived injustice. Nabila, on the other hand, responds with empathy and moral reasoning, urging Endah to reconsider her feelings and act more forgivingly. Female speakers often engage in **relational talk**, where emotions and interpersonal dynamics take center stage

(Holmes, 2013). Nabila's response demonstrates **emotional regulation**, as she uses supportive yet corrective language to mediate Endah's anger. This style of conflict resolution encouraging empathy.

The analysis indicates that **directives (23%)** and **expressives (23%)** are the most frequently occurring illocutionary acts in the series. This suggests that characters often use language to both influence others' actions and to express emotions, which reflects the dynamic and interpersonal nature of everyday interaction. Meanwhile, **commissives (17%)** appear less frequently, indicating that explicit commitments or promises are less central in the dialogue compared to immediate requests or expressions of feelings. In terms of social factors, **occupation (28%)** emerges as the most influential determinant of language variation. This highlights how professional background significantly shapes register, terminology, and communicative strategies. **Gender (12%)**, on the other hand, shows the least impact in the dataset, though it still contributes to differences in politeness strategies and expressive styles.

These findings align with Searle's (1979) classification of illocutionary acts and confirm Wardhaugh's (2006) view that social variables such as occupation and social class strongly affect language use. The high frequency of directive and expressive acts also supports Holmes' (2013) argument that everyday conversation often combines practical action with emotional expression.

Theoretically, this research strengthens the sociopragmatic perspective by showing how illocutionary force is shaped by social context in media discourse. Practically, the results can help scriptwriters create more authentic dialogues that reflect real-life social and cultural diversity in Indonesia. Furthermore, language educators may use these insights to raise students' awareness of how social background influences speech acts in actual communication.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the illocutionary speech acts and their relation to social factors in *Imperfect: The Series 2* using a sociopragmatic framework. The analysis revealed five types of illocutionary acts assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives with directives and expressives occurring most frequently. This finding indicates that interpersonal influence and emotional expression dominate the communicative style of the characters, reflecting everyday conversational practices in Indonesian society. Commissives appeared least frequently, suggesting that explicit commitments or promises are less emphasized in casual media dialogues.

The results also showed that social factors strongly affect the choice and function of speech acts. Occupation emerged as the most dominant factor, shaping registers, terminologies, and interactional styles, while education, social class, and age also contributed significantly to linguistic variation. Gender was found to have a comparatively smaller but still relevant impact, particularly in terms of politeness orientation and expressive strategies. These findings support Searle's (1979) speech act theory and Wardhaugh's (2006) view of social variation, confirming that linguistic choices are inseparable from the speaker's social position and cultural background.

Theoretically, this study contributes to sociopragmatics by demonstrating how illocutionary acts in media discourse are influenced by multiple intersecting social variables. Practically, the results provide useful insights for language education, where awareness of sociopragmatic variation can enhance pragmatic competence. They also benefit media practitioners, especially scriptwriters, by showing how authentic dialogues can reflect Indonesia's sociolinguistic diversity.

In conclusion, *Imperfect: The Series 2* illustrates that language in media is not only a means of communication but also a reflection of identity, culture, and social dynamics. Illocutionary acts function simultaneously as tools of interaction and as markers of social belonging, making them a valuable site for examining the relationship between language, society, and culture.

REFERENCE

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. A. (2020). *Introduction to Research in Education* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Astuti, P. (2020). Social variation in the language of characters in Layangan Putus: A sociolinguistic study. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *8*(2), 35–47.

Biber, D., & Reppen, R. (2020). *The Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Chaer, A., & Agustin, L. (2010). *Sosiolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Rineka Cipta.

Chaika, E. (1982). *Language: The Social Mirror*. Newbury House Publishers.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2020). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Eckert, P. (1997). *Age as a sociolinguistic variable BT - The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (F. Coulmas (ed.); pp. 151–167). Blackwell.

Flick, U. (2021). *Introducing Research Methodology: A Beginner's Guide to Doing a Research Project* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Herring, S. C., & Androutsopoulos, J. (2021). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Digital Communication* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Longman.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Joos, M. (1967). *The Five Clocks*. Harcourt, Brace & World.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper & Row.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.

Mariani, R. (2021). Kajian sosiolinguistik: Variasi bahasa dalam masyarakat. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Budaya*, *5*(1), 67–75.

Meyerhoff, M. (2022). *Introducing Sociolinguistics* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Nababan, P. W. J. (2021). *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu Pengantar*. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Rahmawati, L., Nuraini, N., & Sutri, S. (2024). Tindak tutur dalam video review makanan YouTube sebagai media pembelajaran teks persuasif. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, *12*(1), 55–65.

Rejeki, W. P., & Afnita. (2023). Analisis variasi bahasa pada komentar Instagram Kalis Mardiasih. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, *11*(2), 20–31.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Solehati, M., Sakrim, & Junal. (2022). Variasi bahasa pada unggahan Instagram komunitas Madura. *Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *7*(1), 10–22.

Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Tagliamonte, S. (2022). *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change, Observation, Interpretation*. Wiley-Blackwell.
Trudgill, P. (2021). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society* (5th ed.). Penguin Books.
Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (8th ed.). Wiley Blackwell.
Wati, S. P. (2015). Style variation in the film Snow White and the Huntsman. *Language Horizon*, *3*(1), 45–59.
Zappavigna, M. (2021). *Searchable Talk: Hashtags and Social Media Metadiscourse*. Bloomsbury Academic.