IRJE |Indonesian Research Journal in Education|Vol. 10| No. 1|March|Year 2026|
This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Speech acts in trial at the district attorney's office

NURHASANAH NURHASANAH[1*], BAMBANG SULISTYO[2], ERWANTO ERWANTO[3], RITA NILAWIJAYA[4], AND EMILIA CONTESA[5]

Abstract

This study examines the types of speech acts that occur during trials at the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office, utilizing Austin and Searle's speech act theory and Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory. A qualitative approach was adopted, gathering data through observation and interviews with judges, prosecutors, lawyers, witnesses, and defendants. The findings reveal that locutionary speech acts, which convey information, are prominent in the trial setting. Illocutionary speech acts, such as orders, clarifications, and emotional expressions, were used to achieve specific communicative purposes. Perlocutionary speech acts, which provoke emotional responses or actions, significantly influence the behavior of trial participants. The study highlights the impact of the legal context on the interpretation of these speech acts, emphasizing the importance for legal professionals to be proficient in both legal terminology and the nuances of communication. These dynamics contribute to the effectiveness and fairness of the legal process.

Keywords

Courtroom dynamics, Illocutionary, legal communication, perlocutionary, speech acts

Article History

Received 14 February 2025
Accepted 12 January 2026

How to Cite

Nurhasanah, N., Sulistyo, B., Erwanto, E., Nilawijaya, R., & Contesa, E. (2026). Speech acts in trial at the district attorney's office. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education |IRJE|*, *10*(1), 116-127. https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v10i1.41830

[1] Universitas Baturaja, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia, Corresponding author: nurhasanah@fkip.unbara.ac.id
[2–5] Universitas Baturaja, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Introduction

The trial serves as a highly structured and formal communication arena, where multiple participants, including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, witnesses, and defendants, engage in intricate and purposeful interactions to ensure the proper administration of justice. In this setting, language plays a central role, facilitating the conveyance of information, the building of persuasive arguments, and, ultimately, the determination of legal decisions (Marcheva & Golovina, 2024). As a key element of courtroom interaction, speech acts become not just a means of communication but a mechanism that helps shape the legal process. Each trial participant's use of legal context in interpreting these speech acts emphasizes the importance of legal professionals being aware that their actions are not merely verbal exchanges, but rather actions that can influence the perceptions, behaviors, and outcomes of those involved in the legal proceedings.

This research draws on speech act theory, initially developed by the philosopher Austin (1962) and later expanded by Searle (1969), to analyze courtroom communication at the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office. Speech act theory categorizes speech acts into three primary types: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary acts are those that convey specific meanings through utterances, such as when a judge reads out charges or a witness recounts an event (Lubis, 2018). Illocutionary acts, by contrast, refer to the intended function of the utterance, such as the act of giving orders or making promises, which is frequently observed in judicial commands and lawyer statements during trials (Levinson, 1980). Perlocutionary acts are concerned with the effects or impacts of an utterance on the listener or participant, such as when a defendant's emotional statement provokes an emotional response from the judge or jury (Turaevna, 2018). By analyzing these speech acts in the context of a trial, this research aims to explore how communication is structured and how the legal process is affected by these diverse utterances.

The Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office provides a pertinent setting for such an analysis, as it presents a dynamic in which various trial participants engage in speech acts with specific communicative goals. Judges typically utilize illocutionary acts to issue commands or judgments, such as sentencing a defendant or ordering a recess. In contrast, attorneys may use direct speech acts to request testimony or challenge the credibility of evidence, influencing the progression of the trial. Witnesses and defendants contribute through assertive speech acts, presenting their accounts of the case or offering defences. Meanwhile, perlocutionary speech acts can be observed in the reactions and emotional responses triggered by these utterances, such as expressions of remorse or shifts in courtroom tone (Purnama, 2023). This dynamic demonstrates how language serves as a strategic tool to guide legal arguments, assert authority, and shape perceptions among those involved.

The role of communication in constructing legal narratives and arguments further illustrates the value of studying speech acts in trials. According to Habermas (2015), questioning and asserting are critical speech acts used by legal actors to construct arguments and establish facts, shaping the trial's direction. Prosecutors and defense attorneys often rely on assertive speech acts to present facts and persuade judges or jurors. In contrast, judges issue declarative acts that carry significant authority, influencing the interpretation of the case.

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

In this context, the strategic use of language through speech acts can significantly impact the trial's progression and the outcome of the final decision. Kryk-Kastovsky (2009) states that judges' orders and requests are important to maintaining order and progressing the trial. This highlights the performative nature of speech acts, where language serves not only to inform but also to regulate behavior and shape the courtroom atmosphere.

Learning about the role of speech acts in the Indonesian legal system can help us understand how cultural practices and language norms affect communication. As Purnama (2023) points out, the Indonesian legal system has its own specificities, where language is shaped by cultural values that influence courtroom behavior. For instance, indirect speech acts are often employed by attorneys to maintain politeness and avoid face-threatening actions, especially when questioning witnesses or defendants. This cultural approach to communication affects how speech acts are employed and interpreted within the courtroom, adding a layer of complexity to the trial process. In addition, Rezkian and Simatupang (2024) argue that the use of indirect speech acts reflects the sociocultural expectations within Indonesian society, where face-saving strategies are often prioritized. This makes the study of speech acts particularly relevant for understanding the dynamics of interaction in Indonesian trials and how cultural values intersect with legal procedures.

Moreover, the power dynamics within the courtroom play a pivotal role in determining the types of speech acts employed. As noted by Heidi and Setyaningsih (2024), the courtroom hierarchy, where judges hold ultimate authority, shapes participants' communicative actions. For example, judges use speech acts with high illocutionary force, such as issuing orders or delivering verdicts, which carry significant weight in the trial. On the other hand, witnesses and defendants may use speech acts that express their views. However, these are generally interpreted as supporting or defending their positions rather than shaping the legal process as a judge's speech does. The hierarchical structure of the courtroom, therefore, influences not only the type of speech act used but also how others perceive it. This dynamic illustrates the value of understanding how authority and position impact courtroom communication.

The trial setting also provides an interesting platform for studying both direct and indirect speech acts. Direct speech acts, such as a judge's clear directives or a prosecutor's assertive questioning, clarify the legal process and assert control in the courtroom. These direct acts are essential for maintaining order and ensuring that the trial proceeds in an organized manner. In contrast, indirect speech acts, which are more subtle and often employed by defense attorneys, allow for strategic ambiguity. As Di Donato (2019) notes, lawyers may use indirect speech acts to craft narratives that shape the perceptions of judges or juries, influencing their understanding of the case. This interplay between direct and indirect speech acts highlights the strategic use of language in courtroom interactions and its impact on trial outcomes.

By analyzing the use of speech acts in the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office, this research aims to contribute to the broader field of legal communication. The study examines how speech acts operate within a formal legal context, the impact of cultural and institutional norms on them, and their influence on the trial process. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for enhancing courtroom communication and ensuring fairness in the legal process. As legal practitioners navigate the complexities of courtroom interaction, mastering the subtleties

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

of speech acts becomes essential for fostering transparent and effective communication, ultimately contributing to the integrity of the justice system.

In conclusion, this study examines the role of speech acts in trials at the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office, aiming to explore the nuances of legal communication. By examining how language functions within the courtroom, this research aims to deepen our understanding of how legal arguments are constructed, how authority is asserted, and how emotions and perceptions are shaped through speech. This approach not only offers insights into the legal process but also highlights the importance of language in ensuring that justice is served through clear, persuasive, and fair communication.

Methodology

Research design and data collection method

This study employed a qualitative research design, specifically using a case study approach. A case study was chosen because it provides a deep and detailed exploration of speech acts in a specific, bounded context—the trials at the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office. Data were collected through direct, non-participant observation of courtroom proceedings and semi-structured interviews with trial participants, including judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, witnesses, and defendants.

The researcher attended multiple trial sessions, observing and documenting verbal interactions in real time. Non-participant observation ensured that the researcher remained neutral and did not interfere with the ongoing legal process. The aim was to record natural speech acts, reflecting the actual dynamics of courtroom communication. In addition to manual notetaking, audio recordings of the trial proceedings were made with permission from all relevant parties to ensure accurate documentation of each trial's verbal exchanges. These recordings were transcribed verbatim to capture nuances such as tone, intonation, and pauses that are critical to understanding the full impact of speech acts in the trial context.

Beyond verbal communication, non-verbal elements—such as facial expressions, gestures, and body language—were also observed, as these elements play a significant role in interpreting the meaning of speech acts (Yin, 2018). This holistic approach enabled the collection of a comprehensive dataset that reflected both the verbal and nonverbal aspects of courtroom interaction. Observations were conducted across multiple cases to ensure diversity in the data and to capture different types of speech acts in varying legal contexts.

In addition to observational data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with key participants in the trial. The interviews were designed to explore the participants' experiences and perceptions of the speech acts they used or encountered in the courtroom. These interviews allowed for a more nuanced understanding of the intentions behind specific speech acts, their interpretation, and their impact on the legal process. The interview questions were based on speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) and relevance theory, focusing on themes such as the communicative function of utterances, the role of context in interpreting them, and the emotional and behavioral responses they elicited from trial participants (Kong, 2021). Interviews lasted between 30 and 60 minutes and were audio-recorded with participants' consent to ensure accuracy. The data from these interviews were transcribed and

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

analyzed to explore how the legal context influenced the choice of speech acts, providing insights that were not always directly observable in the trial (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Data analysis procedure

Once the data were collected, the transcription of all trial conversations was carried out. Transcription was done verbatim, with every utterance, intonation, pause, and non-verbal cue recorded to ensure complete accuracy and prevent misinterpretation (Creswell, 2018). The transcripts were then coded based on the role of the speaker (e.g., judge, prosecutor, lawyer, witness, or defendant) to facilitate systematic analysis. Non-verbal elements, such as tone of voice and gestures, were also noted in the transcriptions to provide additional context for understanding the speech acts (Lazaraton, 2020).

The next step in the analysis was to identify and classify the types of speech acts used during the trial, based on the categories outlined by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). This framework divides speech acts into three categories: locutionary acts (the act of producing words with a specific meaning), illocutionary acts (the intention or function behind the utterance), and perlocutionary acts (the impact of the utterance on the listener). The researcher categorized the utterances into three types and further identified specific speech acts, including declarative, assertive, directive, expressive, and commissive speech acts (Azhari et al., 2018). This classification allowed for a clear understanding of the communicative functions each speech act served in the courtroom.

Each transcript was analyzed for its communicative function—whether the utterance was intended to inform, request, command, express emotion, or establish a legal fact. Special attention was given to illocutionary acts, as they represent the core of the communication's intention. For example, judges often use illocutionary speech acts to deliver verdicts or instruct participants to behave in specific ways. Lawyers frequently use directive speech acts to elicit responses from witnesses or opposing parties (Searle, 1969). Perlocutionary acts, which deal with the effect on the listener (such as emotional responses or actions), were also considered. For instance, a defendant's remorseful statement might trigger empathy from the judge or jury.

The analysis was conducted systematically using qualitative analysis software to ensure consistency and rigor in the coding process (Saldaña, 2021). Once the speech acts were categorized, the next phase involved interpreting their role within the context of the trial. This included examining how the speech acts influenced the trial process, such as their impact on legal argumentation, the emotional tone of the trial, or the behaviors of the participants (Patton, 2015).

Data interpretation involved linking the classified speech acts to the broader legal context. For instance, judges' declarative speech acts, such as "guilty" or "not guilty," carry authoritative weight and influence the course of the trial. Similarly, prosecutors' directive speech acts often serve to direct the witness's testimony in ways that align with the prosecution's legal argument. The study also examined how speech acts influenced the emotional dynamics of the trial, with a particular focus on perlocutionary acts, which frequently evoke emotional responses or behavioral changes in trial participants (Flick, 2018).

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Findings

Locutionary speech acts

The analysis of locutionary speech acts in the trial at the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office revealed that the utterances delivered by the judge, prosecutor, lawyer, witness, and defendant maintain a clear and meaningful structure within the legal context. Dominant locutionary speech acts identified include statements of fact, descriptions of events, and clarification of information. For instance, judges often use locutionary speech acts to read charges or explain legal procedures, while witnesses describe the events they have experienced. These utterances serve the basic function of conveying information explicitly and ensuring shared understanding among trial participants. An example of locutionary speech acts is seen in the statement made by the judge after the trial was opened:

> "The Baturaja OKU district court hearing, which tried the civil case, took place on Wednesday, November 27, 2024, at 10:00 WIB in a lawsuit between the parties and with the same hearing structure as the previous hearing."

This statement serves to inform participants about the details of the session without eliciting a specific response. It ensures that trial participants are aware of the proceedings, thereby reducing errors in following the trial. Similarly, when the trial session concludes, the chief judge delivers a statement like:

> "Today's trial has finished and will continue next week on the same day and time. The trial is over!"

This locutionary act provides information, signaling the end of the session and preparing participants for the next one. The chief judge's use of locutionary speech acts here is critical for maintaining the organization and clarity of the legal process.

Furthermore, locutionary speech acts are used to build legal narratives and support each party's arguments. Prosecutors and lawyers use locutionary speech acts to present evidence or ask factual questions to witnesses. The analysis reveals that the accuracy and clarity of locutionary speech acts are crucial for ensuring effective communication and maintaining the trial's flow. However, the interpretation of these locutions often depends on the specific legal context, such as the terminology used and the trial situation.

Illocutionary speech acts and their functions

The analysis of illocutionary speech acts in the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office trial showed that the roles of trial participants determine the functions of the speech acts used. Judges predominantly use illocutionary acts for orders and declarations. For example, judges often issue orders to witnesses or make legal decisions. Prosecutors and lawyers are more likely

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

to use directive illocutionary speech acts, such as asking questions or requesting clarifications from witnesses. On the other hand, witnesses and defendants frequently use assertive illocutionary speech acts to convey information or explain events.

The following table provides examples of illocutionary speech acts identified during the trial, categorized by type and function:

Table 1. *Examples of illocutionary speech acts in trial proceedings and their functions*

Illocutionary Speech Act			
No	Type	Function	Data
1	Expressive	Emotions and Anger	Judge: It wasn't just one time of harassment, but according to you, it wasn't harassment because it was done based on mutual consent. Then?
2	Directive	Order	Judge: Okay, when you called the victim, what did you say and promise to the victim?
3	Assertive	State	Judge: Can you explain again how you persuaded the victim? Suspect: First, I asked her to go out, and then I asked her to go to the boarding house on the pretext of picking up something he had left behind.

The role of locutionary speech acts in trial communication

Locutionary speech acts are foundational to courtroom communication because they provide clear, precise information, ensuring that trial participants are aligned with the process. Judges, prosecutors, and lawyers employ locutionary speech acts to establish the trial's context, clarify the law, and present evidence. For example, the judge's opening statement, such as confirming the date and time of the next session, helps organize the flow of the legal proceedings. This finding is consistent with Searle's (1969) observations, which emphasize that locutionary acts serve not only informational purposes but also play a crucial role in structuring interactions. Furthermore, the precision and clarity of locutionary speech acts are crucial in averting misunderstandings or misinterpretations that may hinder the trial process. As this study found, locutionary speech acts provide the foundation for effective communication in the courtroom, aligning with Larsen's (2022) research, which highlighted the critical role of transparent communication in legal contexts for maintaining procedural transparency and fairness.

In addition, locutionary speech acts ensure that all participants, including the judge, lawyers, and witnesses, share a common understanding of the trial proceedings. According to Holmes (2020), locutionary acts are essential for maintaining the integrity of the trial process, as they provide clear markers of time, structure, and legal boundaries. The use of precise legal terminology, such as "charge," "witness," and "verdict," ensures that participants understand the roles and expectations associated with these terms. Explicit locutionary speech acts reduce the likelihood of ambiguity, which can lead to confusion or legal misinterpretation. This aligns

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

with Bhatia's (2018) argument that, in legal discourse, precision in language plays a vital role in upholding justice, as miscommunication can affect the fairness of the trial.

Illocutionary speech acts and their influence on legal dynamics

Illocutionary speech acts, particularly those employed by judges, prosecutors, and lawyers, are crucial to the trial's dynamics, as they regulate the conversation, establish authority, and guide the actions of participants. For instance, judges use illocutionary speech acts to issue commands, deliver verdicts, or clarify legal procedures. Prosecutors and defence attorneys use directive speech acts to ask questions and request clarifications from witnesses, guiding the development of the case narrative. This aligns with Matoesian's (2001) research, which shows that judges' statements function not only as declarations of law but also as tools for shaping the course of legal argumentation. Illocutionary speech acts also foster the creation of legal narratives. As seen in the trial, the language the prosecutor uses to direct the witness shapes the witness's responses, which, in turn, help build the argument. This dynamic further supports the finding that illocutionary acts are essential for structuring trial discussions, highlighting the performative nature of legal language, as discussed by Turaevna (2018), who found that illocutionary speech acts are central to constructing persuasive legal arguments.

Moreover, illocutionary speech acts can be strategically used by lawyers to influence the course of the trial or the outcome of specific issues. Liddicoat (2021) asserts that illocutionary acts in the courtroom are performative, frequently impacting legal procedures beyond mere information exchange. The use of illocutionary acts by prosecutors and defence attorneys is designed not only to present evidence or request clarification but also to manipulate the trial's outcome. For instance, by asking specific types of questions or framing statements in particular ways, attorneys guide the trial's focus toward their preferred interpretation of the case. These acts are integral to constructing persuasive arguments that may sway the judge or jury, underscoring the centrality of speech in shaping legal outcomes.

Perlocutionary speech acts and emotional dynamics

Perlocutionary speech acts are important because they influence the emotional dynamics and interpersonal interactions within the trial process. Trial participants' emotional responses reflect the impact of these speech acts. For example, a defendant's remorseful statement or a prosecutor's emotionally charged questioning can influence how judges or juries perceive the sincerity or credibility of the parties involved. According to Dragojevic et al. (2016), the use of perlocutionary speech acts in the courtroom can subtly guide emotional responses, shaping the perceptions of witnesses, defendants, and jurors. In the present study, perlocutionary effects were observed in participants' reactions following emotionally charged exchanges, as indicated by shifts in tone or facial expressions, which suggested changes in mood or perspective. This also aligns with Nick's (2017) findings, which emphasized the strategic use of perlocutionary speech acts in legal contexts to manipulate emotional responses that influence decision-making. Thus, the use of perlocutionary speech acts demonstrates the value of conveying not only information but also managing the courtroom's emotional atmosphere.

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

Furthermore, perlocutionary speech acts also provide the emotional undercurrent that influences the credibility of the trial participants. According to Goffman (2020), emotional responses in the courtroom are strategically used to either strengthen or challenge arguments. When a witness displays emotion or a defendant expresses remorse, it can influence how their testimony or defence is perceived. Perlocutionary speech acts, such as emotionally charged statements or questions, have the potential to evoke sympathy or scepticism from the judge, jury, or other participants. This emotional manipulation shapes the trial's narrative, as emotional responses are often intertwined with legal considerations. As Dragojevic et al. (2016) argue, the strategic use of perlocutionary speech acts in trials can significantly influence decision-making, illustrating the value of managing emotions in the courtroom.

Legal context and its role in shaping speech act interpretation

The legal context significantly influences the interpretation and function of speech acts within the trial. The roles of the speakers, particularly the judge, prosecutor, and defence attorney, influence how people perceive speech acts. For instance, a judge's statement is generally understood as an authoritative directive or ruling because of the institutional power vested in the judge. This power dynamic shapes how participants respond to the speech acts of judges and lawyers, as Jucker (2024) highlighted, arguing that institutional roles and relationships heavily influence speech acts in legal contexts. Additionally, legal terminology used by participants, such as "charge," "verdict," or "objection," carries specific legal meanings that shape the interpretation of the speech acts involved. Alston (2000) observed that speech acts within the legal context are not solely linguistic; they are constrained by the institutional framework, which directs their intended meaning and function. This finding is consistent with the study's results, which demonstrate that the meaning of speech acts is co-constructed through interaction within a specific legal context, where power relations and legal authority influence the dynamics of communication.

Moreover, the legal context is not limited to institutional roles; it also encompasses broader cultural and social norms that influence courtroom communication. According to Zhang (2024), cultural norms within legal systems influence the interpretation of speech acts, highlighting the significant role of local context in shaping how language is understood in legal proceedings. For instance, in some jurisdictions, the tone and emotional content of speech acts may be more scrutinized due to cultural expectations around politeness, respect, and authority. This study confirms that understanding the broader legal, social, and cultural context is essential to accurately interpreting speech acts. As Wilson (2019) argues, the context of power and authority within the courtroom is crucial for understanding the meanings and effects of speech acts, emphasizing the need for a holistic approach to analyzing legal discourse.

Conclusion

This research concludes that speech acts in trials at the Baturaja OKU District Attorney's Office play a critical role in supporting the legal process through structured, contextually appropriate communication. Locutionary speech acts, which convey explicit

This is an Open Access article, published by Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

information such as statements of fact and clarifications, are essential for constructing legal narratives. Illocutionary speech acts, on the other hand, reflect the specific communicative intent of trial participants, including commands, questions, and emotional expressions, all of which highlight the roles and objectives of everyone involved in the trial. The analysis also reveals that perlocutionary speech acts have a significant influence on the emotional dynamics and actions within the courtroom, affecting the overall flow of the trial.

Furthermore, this research confirms that the legal context has a profound influence on the interpretation of speech acts in trials. Legal norms, procedures, and specialized terminology create a unique interpretive framework that shapes how utterances are understood. Its content does not solely determine the meaning of a statement but is also influenced by the speaker's role and the specific circumstances of the trial. For example, a judge's statement is often interpreted as a binding decision due to the authority associated with their position, which carries considerable weight in the courtroom. In contrast, statements from defendants or witnesses are typically viewed as defences or factual contributions, reflecting their roles as individuals providing testimony or explanations.

This study highlights that speech acts in trials serve multiple purposes beyond basic communication; they are integral to navigating the legal process. The strategic use of language can direct the flow of the trial, shape jurors' perceptions, and ultimately influence the outcomes of legal proceedings. By understanding the interplay between speech acts and the legal context, the effectiveness of communication among trial participants is enhanced, ensuring that all contributions are appropriately framed within the established legal framework.

Moreover, this context-specific interpretation underscores the importance of legal practitioners being skilled not only in legal language but also in the subtleties of courtroom communication. By mastering the nuances of speech acts, judges, lawyers, and other participants can promote more transparent dialogue, mitigate misunderstandings, and contribute to a more equitable and efficient judicial process. Ultimately, recognizing the significant role of speech acts within the legal context facilitates effective legal practice and reinforces the integrity of the justice system.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Alston, W. P. (2000). *Speech acts and the philosophy of language*. Oxford University Press.

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

Azhari, A. S., Priono, P., & Nuriadi, N. (2018). Speech acts of classroom interaction. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *4*(2), 24-45.

Bhatia, V. K. (2018). *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage Publications.

Di Donato, F. (2019). The strategic use of speech acts in courtroom discourse: A pragmatic analysis. *Journal of Legal Communication, 12*(4), 78-94.

Dragojevic, M., Gasiorek, J., & Giles, H. (2016). *Communication accommodation theory: Negotiating personal relationships and social identities across contexts*. Cambridge University Press.

Flick, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Sage Publications.

Goffman, E. (2020). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Routledge.

Habermas, J. (2015). *The theory of communicative action: Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society*. John Wiley & Sons.

Heidi, S., & Setyaningsih, R. (2024). The use of speech acts in courtroom interaction: An analysis of judges' and lawyers' discourse strategies. *Journal of Legal Discourse, 22*(1), 45-60.

Holmes, J. (2020). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Routledge.

Jucker, A. H. (2024). *Speech acts: Discursive, multimodal, diachronic*. Cambridge University Press.

Kong, W. (2021). Relevance theory in courtroom communication. *Journal of Pragmatics, 98*(1), 110-124.

Kryk-Kastovsky, M. (2009). The performative nature of speech acts in legal contexts. *Linguistics and Law, 15*(3), 200-215.

Larsen, A. V. (2022). Functions of legal contracts: An analysis of macrostructure and speech acts in contracts represented by the example of German tenancy contracts. *Globe: A Journal of Language, Culture and Communication, 14*, 94-118.

Lazaraton, A. (2020). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Routledge.

Levinson, S. C. (1980). Speech act theory: The state of the art. *Language Teaching, 13*(1-2), 5-24.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2021). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. Routledge.

Lubis, I. S. (2018). Bentuk dan fungsi tindak tutur ilokusi dalam teks Makkobar (Forms and functions of illocutionary speech acts in the Makkobar text). *Jurnal Education and Development, 4*(2), 72-79.

Marcheva, P. E., & Golovina, N. M. (2024). The art of persuasion in the courtroom: A reflection on courtroom rhetoric, possible risks, and technological advancements. *Kutafin Law Review, 11*(4), 843-860.

Matoesian, G. (2001). Language and material conduct in legal discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 17*(5), 634-660.

Nick, I. M. (2017). Speaking of language and law: Conversations on the work of Peter Tiersma. *Language and Law/Linguagem e Direito, 4*(1), 183-188.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Sage Publications.

Purnama, M. (2023). Analysis of speech acts in Indonesian courts: A case study of prosecutorial language. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies, 8(*2), 134-150.

Rezkian, M., & Simatupang, R. (2024). Pragmatic strategies in Indonesian courtrooms: Speech acts in action. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 31*(2), 233-245.

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Turaevna, K. H. (2018). The ethics of legal rhetoric: Considering the ethical implications of using persuasive language and argumentation in legal contexts. *Miasto Przyszłości, 48*, 294-296.

Wilson, J. (2019). *Speech acts in legal discourse: Power dynamics in legal settings*. Oxford University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage Publications.

Zhang, J. (2024). Cultural influences on courtroom communication: A cross-cultural analysis of speech acts. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Pragmatics, 18*(2), 145-160.