e-ISSN: 3025-8189 ; p-ISSN: 3025-8197

LANCAH JURNAL INOVASI DAN TREN

doi.org/10.35870/ljit.v4i2.9174

Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026

PP. 2138-2148

Homepage http://www.journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

# Illocutionary Changes and Student Uptake of Generative AI Feedback in Public Service Announcement Script Revision

**Rawinda Fitrotul Mualafina[1], Siti Ulfiyani[2], Raden Yusuf Sidiq Budiawan[3*], Mukhlis[4], Muna Rafidah[5]**

Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Language and Arts Education, Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia[1,2,3,4,5]

Corresponding Author's Email: r.yusuf.s.b@upgris.ac.id

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Article History:**

*Submitted* *11 03, 2026*
*Accepted* *11 24, 2026*
*Published* *11 28, 2026*

***ABSTRACT***

*Students who revise a persuasive script with the help of generative AI may change how the text sounds without changing what it asks the audience to do. This study examines that difference in the closing messages of public service announcement (PSA) scripts written by 24 students in an Indonesian university course in February 2026. For each script, the closing of the initial and final versions was extracted as written and coded for representative and directive functions following Searle (1976). Each pair was then classified as unchanged, changed in wording only, or changed in function. The first coding was prepared with AI assistance, and a second author coded independently; the two coders agreed on 85% of decisions (Cohen's κ = 0.72) and resolved their differences through discussion. Most closings already asked the audience to act in the initial version (21 of 24). Three closings remained unchanged, 19 changed only in wording, and two gained a function, one of which was a judgment call. Because the AI's suggestions and the students' prompts were not coded and no revision without AI was compared, the study cannot determine what the AI contributed; it describes one class only.*

***Keywords***: *speech acts; illocutionary force; generative AI; public service announcement; Indonesian language education*

**How to Cite:**

Mualafina, R. F., Ulfiyani, S., Budiawan, R. Y. S., Mukhlis, M., & Rafidah, M. (2026). Illocutionary Changes and Student Uptake of Generative AI Feedback in Public Service Announcement Script Revision. LANCAH: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Tren, 4(2), 2138-2148. https://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit/article/view/9174

Copyright @ 2026. Published by Lembaga Komunitas Informasi Teknologi Aceh (KITA), Indonesia. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). Based on a work at http://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Abstract & Indexing CC BY-NC 4.0 OPEN ACCESS

## INTRODUCTION

Writing a public service announcement (PSA) script is a persuasion task and a regular assignment in the *Berbicara* (Speaking) course of an Indonesian language and literature education program. A PSA seeks to change what an audience thinks or does; providing information is only part of that task (Sivakumaran et al., 2023). The writer must therefore manage illocutionary force, the act an utterance performs, such as stating a fact or urging someone to act (Searle, 1976).

Instructors may find it difficult to give specific feedback on every draft, especially in large courses, and AI tools may fill part of that gap. Feedback tends to be more useful when it is specific and tied to the task (Hattie & Timperley, 2007), and revision in second-language persuasive writing has been studied in online peer settings (A. W. Li & Hebert, 2024). AI tools based on large language models can serve as a revision partner that students use independently.

AI feedback can help learners, but learners do not accept all of it. In one study, 40 EFL learners in China improved their speaking scores after receiving feedback from an AI speech evaluation program (Zou et al., 2023). In a study of 45 computer science students who sought ChatGPT feedback on argumentative essays, nearly 40% of the suggestions were contested or ignored (Chen et al., 2024). Those students also rejected a larger share of content-level than form-level feedback. Selective uptake is not specific to AI: in online peer feedback on second-language persuasive writing, student writers generally followed peer suggestions on content and knowingly set aside points they disagreed with (A. W. Li & Hebert, 2024). Process-oriented work describes how writers interact with the tool, for instance, doctoral students writing with ChatGPT (Nguyen et al., 2024).

Recent reviews suggest that uptake is rarely measured and depends on the learner. Craven and Fredrick (2026) scoped 185 empirical studies of LLM-generated feedback in L2 writing and found that learner uptake is rarely measured as a primary outcome. Alghamdi and Alghizzi (2026) systematically reviewed learner interaction with AI-mediated feedback and described higher-regulation learners as selective and recursive in evaluating suggestions, and lower-regulation learners as quicker and less critical in accepting them. The present study does not measure uptake; its attention is on what the revised text itself carries.

Much of the research reviewed here centers on English, and the Indonesian studies identified do not examine AI-assisted revision of persuasive scripts. A review of 144 articles on generative AI in language learning and teaching found that 86.1% concerned EFL contexts (B. Li et al., 2025). Much work on uptake also sorts feedback by level, form, or content (Chen et al., 2024). One recent study of Indonesian university students examined perceptions, writing outcomes, and challenges of AI feedback for English academic writing (Wahyuni et al., 2026). Tressyalina et al. (2026) evaluated an AI-mediated platform for teaching Indonesian pragmatics and reported gains on pragmatic tests and discourse completion tasks. That platform was purpose-built and judged by test outcomes; thus, AI consultation that students direct themselves while revising a course text was not its object.

The Indonesian speech act studies identified analyzed existing texts rather than student drafts. Searle's categories have been applied to Indonesian digital discourse (Rahman et al., 2026) and to an animated film, a television show, and a public speech. Muttaqin and Kusuma (2024) found directives and assertives to be the most frequent categories in the film, and Suwija et al. (2024) found assertives most frequent in the television show (33 of 79 utterances), with directives at 21. Said et al. (2024) found four categories in the speech: assertive, directive, commissive, and expressive. Two gaps follow. The first is

empirical: how Indonesian-language persuasive scripts change when students revise them with AI assistance that they direct themselves. The second is analytic: treating the speech function of the revised text as the object of comparison across versions. Among the sources reviewed, none addressed both gaps. Because the review was narrative, this conclusion holds only for the sources consulted.

This study adopts Searle's (1976) representative and directive categories as its main lens because a PSA closing often has to inform and to prompt action. Indirect directives follow Searle (1975). The term "force" refers to what a closing does, whereas "function" refers to the code assigned to it. "Illocutionary change" is a label coined for this study, not an established construct: it denotes an identifiable function in the final closing that the initial closing did not carry. A revision may also change only the wording or leave the closing as it was.

This study describes the illocutionary force of closing messages in student PSA scripts revised with generative AI. It addresses two questions: (1) Which illocutionary functions do the closings of the initial and final scripts carry? and (2) How do the two versions differ, not at all, in wording only, or in function? The study is descriptive, covers one class, and is intended to be useful to instructors considering AI-assisted revision in persuasive writing courses. It cannot estimate what AI feedback does to script quality or persuasion, and it sets aside how students used the suggestions they received.

## METHODS OF RESEARCH

### 1) Research design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design: content analysis of paired script versions. Frequencies are reported only to show how often each code occurred in this class, and no inference is made beyond that. A qualitative design suits the aim of describing how closing messages changed in context, which statistical measurement alone cannot capture (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

### 2) Participants and data

The data were drawn from one class a *Berbicara* (Speaking) course in an Indonesian language and literature education program, in the even semester of 2025/2026. In a structured independent assignment, each student wrote a PSA script for an educational video, submitted the draft to a generative AI platform of their choice, requested revision feedback, read the response, and wrote a revised version. Consulting an AI tool was a required step; therefore, students directed the consultations but did not initiate them.

The consultations were otherwise left to the students. No standard prompt was provided: students chose the platform, wrote their own prompts, and could consult the AI as often as they wished. This approach keeps the consultations close to ordinary practice, but it rules out any controlled comparison of prompts or platforms. The revision is called AI-assisted because the assignment required the consultation; the data do not show how much of the AI's output reached the final script. Data were collected from 2 to 27 February 2026.

Twenty-four students participated. They were the students who completed every stage of the assignment: the initial script, the AI consultation, and the final script. The code S02 was assigned before the data were checked and is not used; consequently, the codes run from S01 to S25 with one gap.

**3) Unit of analysis**

For each script, the unit of analysis was the closing: the last stretch of text addressed directly to the audience (narration, on-screen text, or a concluding message). It begins where the script leaves scene or dialogue for the message itself and runs to the end. Each boundary was set with both versions in view and recorded in the supplementary file. Only the closing was coded; students' prompts, the AI's suggestions, and the rest of each script were not.

The initial and final texts were copied as written from the compiled script files. For four scripts, the tabulation of the scripts before consultation and the compiled submitted scripts disagreed (S04 final, S05 initial, S12 initial, S23 final); in those cases, the compiled submitted scripts were used. Quoted Indonesian appears in italics, followed by an English gloss in single quotation marks.

**4) Coding and analysis**

The function of each closing, in both its initial and final versions, was coded as representative (REP), directive (DIR), or both (DIR+REP, written in alphabetical order), following Searle (1976) (Table 1). Coding captured what the text does on its face, not what the student intended or how viewers would react. An utterance was counted as an indirect directive when it named a concrete action for the audience, even without an imperative marker (Searle, 1975). Searle (1976) counts questions as directives, but this study did not, unless the question named an action. A viewer cannot answer a script's question, so it mostly invites reflection; a question that names no action asks the viewer to do nothing. A request to attend or to remember, with no action specified, was not coded as a directive either.

Each pair was then sorted into one of four types of change: no change, wording only, function added, or function lost. Because the AI's suggestions were not coded, it cannot be determined whether a change came from a suggestion, a prompt, or the student.

**Table 1. Coding scheme and operational criteria**

| Dimension | Code | Operational criterion |
|---|---|---|
| Illocutionary function | REP | Presents information, a state of affairs, an explanation, or a proposition for the audience to consider. |
| | DIR | Prompts, recommends, requests, or encourages a specific audience action, through an explicit imperative or exhortative marker (e.g., mari, ayo, yuk) or an indirect act that specifies a concrete action. Interrogative form alone is not enough. A request to believe or to attend, with no specified action, is not DIR. |
| | DIR+REP | Both functions are identifiable in the unit. |
| Type of change | NON | Wording is identical once punctuation and capitalization are ignored. |
| | FRM | Wording differs and the set of functions is the same. This includes substitution, condensing, and added or removed sentences that do not add or remove a function. |
| | ADD | The final unit carries an identifiable function that the initial unit did not. The data do not show who introduced it (the AI, the prompt, or the student). |

| Dimension | Code | Operational criterion |
|---|---|---|
| | RED | The initial unit carried a function that the final unit does not. This category was defined and not observed. |

(Source: Authors' coding guide, adapted from Searle, 1975, 1976)

**5) Trustworthiness**

The first coding was prepared with the assistance of an AI assistant (see the AI use statement). A second author, who had not seen those codes, then coded all 24 closings independently using the same coding guide. Agreement was computed over the initial and final codes of the 24 closings (48 coded decisions). It was 85%, and Cohen's κ was 0.72, which is usually read as substantial (Landis & Koch, 1977). The two coders settled their disagreements by discussion, and Table 2 reports the settled codes. With only 24 units, κ is a rough guide and its uncertainty is wide.

**6) Ethical considerations**

The data were originally collected as part of a regular classroom assignment. In May 2026, after the assignment was completed, all participants gave written consent for the use of their materials in research. The informed consent form outlined the purpose of the study, the intended use of the data, and the participants' right to withdraw without academic consequences. To ensure confidentiality, all materials were anonymized and assigned identification codes (S01–S25, with S02 not used). Research permission was formally granted in May 2026 by the Dean of the Faculty of Language and Arts (FPBS), Universitas PGRI Semarang, as documented in official permission letter No. 343/FPBS/UPGRIS/V/2026, and by the Head of the Study Program. Participation was voluntary, and students' decisions regarding participation did not affect their academic assessment or standing. The full scripts and chat logs, which constitute students' coursework, are not publicly available in a repository in order to protect participants' privacy and academic work. The initial and final closings of all 24 scripts are provided as written in the supplementary file, without student names.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**1) Functions carried by the closings**

Most closings already asked the audience to act in the initial version. Twenty-one of the 24 initial closings did so: 20 combined a directive with a representative component (DIR+REP), and one (S15) was purely directive. The other three were purely representative (S05, S06, S23). In the final versions, 22 closings were DIR+REP, and two (S05, S23) were purely representative. Three closings did not change, 19 changed in wording only, and two gained a function. None lost a function (Tables 2 and 3).

**Table 2. Coding results for the closing of each script**

| Code | Initial function | Final function | Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| S01 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S03 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S04 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | NON |
| S05 | REP | REP | FRM |
| S06 | REP | DIR+REP | ADD |
| S07 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S08 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S09 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | NON |
| S10 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S11 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S12 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S13 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S14 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S15 | DIR | DIR+REP | ADD |
| S16 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S17 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S18 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S19 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | NON |
| S20 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S21 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S22 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S23 | REP | REP | FRM |
| S24 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |
| S25 | DIR+REP | DIR+REP | FRM |

(Source: Research data, 2026; codes as in Table 1. † Judgment call, see Subsections 3 and 4 and the Limitations. Code S02 is not used.)

**Table 3. Initial function by type of change (f)**

| Initial function | NON | FRM | ADD | RED | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DIR+REP | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| REP | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| DIR | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 3 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 24 |

(Source: Research data, 2026)

**2) Closings that already asked for action**

Most closings were already performing the required job in the initial version and kept doing so. S24 is a typical case: the initial closing ended with an invitation for the audience to start with themselves:

> *Yuk mulai dari diri sendiri berhenti menormalisasikan kata kasar.* 'Come on, let us start with ourselves and stop normalizing harsh words.' (S24, initial)

The final closing retained the invitation but reworded it:

> *Yuk, mulai dari diri sendiri. Berhenti menormalisasi penggunaan kata kasar.* 'Come on, let us start with ourselves. Stop normalizing the use of harsh words.' (S24, final)

The change in S24 is lexical; therefore, it was coded as a wording-only change. In S09, the invitation survived apart from punctuation (initial: *Ayo mulai dari diri sendiri buang sampah pada tempatnya.*; final: *Ayo mulai dari diri sendiri. Buang sampah pada tempatnya.*), and no change was coded.

Wording-only changes sometimes involved added sentences. In S11, the final closing added *Pikir bukan Cuma soal estetika, tapi soal menghargai waktu orang lain* ('Parking is not only about looks but about respecting other people's time') alongside the same call to park neatly. The new sentence provides a reason, but the initial closing already contained both a reason and a call to action; therefore, its functions remained the same.

**3) Closings that gained a function**

S15 is the clearest case. The initial closing was a directive that named a concrete behavior:

> *Mari tunjukkan kualitas mahasiswa yang beradab dengan antri secara tertib dan tidak memaksakan masuk jika kapasitas sudah penuh.* 'Let us show the quality of well-mannered students by queuing in an orderly way and not forcing our way in when the capacity is already full.' (S15, initial)

The final closing added a general statement of value and kept the call to queue:

> *Kuliah boleh tinggi, tapi etika tetap yang utama. Budayakan antre dan hargai kenyamanan bersama. Mari jadi mahasiswa beradab, mulai dari depan pintu lift.* 'Studies may rise high, but ethics still comes first. Make queuing a habit and respect everyone's comfort. Let us be well-mannered students, starting at the lift door.' (S15, final)

The representative component is new. However, the request itself became vaguer because the final closing no longer mentions not pushing into a full lift. The function increased while the request lost some of its concreteness.

S06 is a judgment call. The initial closing was a statement:

> *Karena, orang lain mungkin bisa lupa dengan apa yang berikan. Tetapi orang lain tidak akan lupa dengan cara kita memperlakukannya.* 'Because other people may forget what [we] give. But other people will not forget how we treat them.' (S06, initial)

The final one ends with a question:

> *Mungkin orang lain akan lupa dengan apa yang pernah kita berikan, tetapi mereka tidak akan pernah lupa dengan cara kita memperlakukan mereka. Jadi, sudahkah kamu menggunakan kata ajaib hari ini?* 'Other people may forget what we once gave, but they will never forget how we treated them. So, have you used the magic words today?' (S06, final)

The question names an action, using the magic words, so we read it as an indirect directive under Table 1. A question alone would not have been enough. Someone who does not count it as a directive would code S06 as wording only, and S15 would then be the only closing that gained a function.

**4) Closings that were representative only**

Two closings were purely representative in both versions (S05 and S23), and the interpretation of a single word in each determined their codes. The final S05 ends with *Ingatlah* ('Remember'), and the initial S23 uses *Ingat* ('Remember') before a quotation. Under Table 1, these are requests to attend because no action is specified. A reader who counts them as directives would code S05 as gaining a function and S23 as losing one. Together with the interpretation of S06, these alternatives would yield between one and three closings with a function added and at most one with a function lost. Under every combination, between 17 and 20 closings would still have changed in wording only. All three closings are flagged as judgment calls.

**5) Interpretation and implications**

Most closings already did what a PSA is meant to do, informing and urging action (Sivakumaran et al., 2023), before AI entered the picture, so there was little room to add a function. In this class, 20 of 24 closings began with both functions, which is unsurprising for an assignment built around persuasion.

The pattern aligns with Indonesian speech act studies that report numerous directives and assertives (Muttaqin & Kusuma, 2024; Suwija et al., 2024). Those studies, however, examined an animated film and a television show rather than student drafts.

The present results are compatible with the selective uptake described by Chen et al. (2024), but they do not test it. Chen et al. found that second-language writers contested or ignored a large share of AI suggestions and rejected more content-level than form-level feedback. It cannot be determined whether the students in this study contested anything because suggestions and prompts were not coded. What can be observed is that wording changed in most closings and function changed in two. One possibility is that students used AI mostly to polish expression, but these data cannot test that hypothesis; doing so would require coded suggestions set against the revisions. The regulation profiles described by Alghamdi and Alghizzi (2026) could be linked to this kind of outcome in later work. They described higher-regulation learners as selective and recursive with AI suggestions and lower-regulation learners as quicker to accept them. No measure of self-regulation was available, so the 24 students cannot be placed on that scale. Paired versions could provide such studies with a text-level outcome, namely, whether the function of a closing changed, and studies that also measure regulation or reflection could ask whether different learners differ in this respect.

Several implications follow for lecturers. Placing the initial and final versions side by side quickly shows whether a revision changed what a closing asks the audience to do or only how it says so. S15 illustrates a revision that added a statement of value while losing a concrete behavior. Since most closings already asked for action, it may be worth commenting on how concrete the requested action is. If students also submit both versions and state what act each closing is meant to perform, lecturers can check changes in function without additional coding. These are suggestions for practice that the data do not test.

**6) Limitations**

The findings are limited by the sample and by the way the data were compiled. This study covers one class, and the 24 closings are one per script. The 24 participants are the students who completed every stage; therefore, the sample may lean toward students who persisted with the assignment. For four scripts (S04, S05, S12, S23), the two compilations of texts disagreed, and the compiled submitted scripts were used. No interviews or reflections from the students and no audience responses were collected; thus, their reasons and the persuasive effect remain unexamined. The counts describe this class and should not be read as estimates for other classes or tools.

The coding and the design introduce further limitations. The unit boundaries were drawn with both versions in view, so they may have followed visible differences, and a different boundary could change a code. Two functions cannot register other kinds of change, such as added emotion or added reasons. Four codings (S05, S06, S20, S23) rest on judgment calls: three concern how to read a marker or a question, and one (S20) concerns where the closing begins. Agreement between the coders was substantial but not perfect (85%; $\kappa = 0.72$), and $\kappa$ derived from 24 units is imprecise. Neither the AI's suggestions nor the students' prompts were coded; therefore, it cannot be determined whether a change was suggested by the AI,

requested by the student, or made by the student. No revision condition without AI was included, and the data do not show whether peers or the lecturer also influenced the revisions.

## CONCLUSION

In this class of 24 students, most PSA closings already asked the audience to act (21 of 24). Revision with AI assistance mostly changed the wording (19 closings), while three remained the same and two gained a function. These results derive from one class and two coarse codes; they cannot show that AI caused or improved any change because suggestions and prompts were not coded and no revision without AI was compared. Lecturers who permit AI-assisted revision could ask students to submit both versions and to identify the act each closing is meant to perform so that changes in function can be checked. Future studies should code the suggestions and prompts, include a revision condition without AI, and involve more than one class.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: [SU, RYSB]; Methodology: [RFM, M]; Formal Analysis: [RFM, SU]; Investigation: [SU, RYSB, MR]; Data Curation: [SU, RYSB, MR]; Writing-Original Draft: [RYSB, MF]; Writing-Review & Editing: [SU]; Supervision: [M, RFM]. All authors have approved the final manuscript.

## FUNDING

This research was supported by the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM), Universitas PGRI Semarang, through an internal regular research grant scheme.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

## ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USE STATEMENT

The students used generative AI platforms as revision tools in their assignment, and the resulting chat logs and scripts constitute the data of this study. The authors extracted and aligned the texts, prepared and settled the codes, and wrote all sections of this article. In preparing the manuscript, the authors used Claude (Anthropic) and Grammarly only to edit the language of text they had written, namely, grammar, wording, and sentence clarity. The authors reviewed every edit and take full responsibility for the content, the interpretation of the findings, and the accuracy and integrity of the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

Alghamdi, L. H., & Alghizzi, T. M. (2026). Metacognitive Filtering and Cognitive Offloading in AI-Assisted L2 Writing: A PRISMA Guided Process-Tracing Synthesis. *Behavioral Sciences*, *16*(7), 1229. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs16071229

Chen, Z., Zhu, C., Qi, L., & Wei, W. (2024). L2 students' barriers in engaging with form and content-focused AI-generated feedback in revising their compositions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *39*(3), 715–735. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2422478

Craven, L., & Fredrick, D. R. (2026). LLM-Generated Feedback in L2 Writing: A Scoping Review. *Education Sciences*, *16*(8), 1196. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16081196

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data. *Biometrics*, *33*(1), 159. https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310

Li, A. W., & Hebert, M. (2024). Unpacking an online peer-mediated and self-reflective revision process in second-language persuasive writing. *Reading and Writing*, *37*(6), 1545–1573. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10466-8

Li, B., Tan, Y. L., Wang, C., & Lowell, V. (2025). Two years of innovation: A systematic review of empirical generative AI research in language learning and teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *9*, 100445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100445

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation: 4th edition*. Jossey-Bass.

Muttaqin, M. Z., & Kusuma, E. R. (2024). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi dalam Tuturan Tokoh Film Animasi "Dhot Design" Episode "Liburan ke Pantai." *BASINDO : Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia, Dan Pembelajarannya*, *8*(2), 308. https://doi.org/10.17977/um007v8i22024p308-321

Nguyen, A., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Huang, X. (2024). Human-AI collaboration patterns in AI-assisted academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, *49*(5), 847–864. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2323593

Rahman, F., Rafli, Z., & Anwar, M. (2026). Digital narratives of Indonesian culinary culture on YouTube: a qualitative speech act and netnographic study of food vloggers. *Journal of Ethnic Foods*, *13*(1), 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42779-026-00315-8

Said, U. M. R., Tsani, M. J., & Sopian, A. (2024). Analisis Tindak Tutur Abu Ubaidah Dalam Pidato 36 Hari Pasca Perang Hamas-Israel: Teori John Searle. *El-Tsaqafah : Jurnal Jurusan PBA*, *23*(2), 289–306. https://doi.org/10.20414/tsaqafah.v23i2.10051

Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 59–82). Academic Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, *5*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837

Sivakumaran, B., R. M., H., Nandakumar, N., & Srivastava, E. (2023). Public service announcements: A literature review and way forward. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *47*(6), 2451–2478. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12942

Suwija, I. N. R., Tantri, A. A. S., & Dewantara, I. P. M. (2024). Analisis tindak tutur ilokusi "Lapor Pak!" pada tayangan YouTube Trans7 Official dan relevansinya terh adap pembelajaran teks anekdot.

*Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha*, *14*(3). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbsi.v14i3.79868

Tressyalina, T., Ghaluh, B. M., Wulandari, E., Noveria, E., & Arief, E. (2026). New Ways to Teach and Learn Pragmatics for Advancing Academic Communication Competence: An AI-Mediated Multimodal Platform. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688261446189

Wahyuni, S., Dewi, D. S., Wulandari, R. S., Thohiriyah, Kurniadi, D., Muawanah, F. H., Chairunnisa, N. Z., & Ardhi, M. A. (2026). Evaluating students' perceptions, writing outcomes, and challenges in using AI-based feedback systems for english academic writing. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, *9*(8), 2026380. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2026380

Zou, B., Du, Y., Wang, Z., Chen, J., & Zhang, W. (2023). An Investigation into Artificial Intelligence Speech Evaluation Programs With Automatic Feedback for Developing EFL Learners' Speaking Skills. *Sage Open*, *13*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231193818