

Translation Analysis of Directive Speech Act in Fang Runin's Utterances in The Dragon Republic Novel

Alauddin Akmal¹

¹Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

^{1*} alauddinakmal@student.uns.ac.id,

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received July 06, 2026

Revised October 20, 2026

Accepted October 21, 2026

Available online October 21, 2026

Keywords:

Directive Speech Act; Translation Technique; Translation Quality



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.
Copyright © 2023 by Author. Published by Universitas Sebelas Maret.

ABSTRACT

This research focuses on the analysis of directive speech act translation uttered by Fang Runin in the Dragon Republic novel. This research covers the analysis of directive speech act subcategories, translation techniques, and translation quality in terms of accuracy, acceptability and readability. The data were obtained from two sources, documents in the form of novel entitled the Dragon Republic and Republik Naga, and informants: raters. This research employed purposive sampling technique in selecting the data and informants. In collecting the data, this research employed document analysis and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The findings revealed a total of 152 instances of directive speech acts uttered by Fang Runin. These speech acts were classified into six subcategories, question (70 data), requirement (44 data), requestive (20 data), prohibitive (7 data), advisory (7 data) and permissive (4 data), showing question as the most dominant subcategory. This research also identified 13 translation techniques dominated by established equivalent. Lastly, the overall translation score is 2.93. The findings suggested that the translator managed to produce a high-quality translation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Literary works such as novel or movie mimic the human interaction in the real world. One of its examples is the use of directive speech act. Directive speech acts are often used by speakers to achieve specific goals, such as giving orders, making requests (Sanjaya et al, 2024). Directive speech act is a speech act that a speaker uses to make the hearer do a certain action (Searle, 1976). Furthermore, Bach and Harnish (1979) added that directive speech act expresses the speaker's desire to make the hearer perform a prospective action, with the speaker's utterance serving as the reason for the hearer to perform that action.

Bach and Harnish (1979) further classify directive speech act into six subcategories based on their expressed attitude; (1) requirement, a subcategory in which the main driving of the utterance is the speaker's authority. (2) requestive, the subcategory in which the utterance's driving factor is the speaker's desire which make the hearer has the ability to refuse. (3) question, a subcategory that expresses the speaker's desire to gain information. (4) advisory, a subcategory where the speaker expresses an action that will benefit the hearer. (5) prohibitive, a subcategory that expresses an intention to restrain the hearer from doing an action by using the speaker's authority. (6) permissive, a subcategory in which the speaker removes restriction or grants permission for hearer to perform an action.

In performing directive speech acts, there are two variables that must be considered (De Pablos-Ortega, 2020), namely the relationship between the interlocutors including the social distance and power and the intended action the speaker wants the hearer to perform. However, preserving the meaning and these key variables often pose a challenge in translating directive speech acts. This is because every culture has a distinct way of expression, concepts, and values that may be lost in direct translation (Guo & Yu, 2023). Therefore, in translating directive speech act, the translator should not only focus on selecting the right word choice but also focus on preserving the communicative intention of the utterance (Handayani, 2020).

The topic of directive speech act translation in literary works has inspired numerous studies conducted by previous researchers. Sakulpimolrat (2019) analyzed the translation of directive speech act in the

Little Prince novel including the translation techniques and translation quality. However, she does not examine the types or subcategories of directive speech act in her research. Another research conducted by Bathara and Noverino (2023) also examined directive speech act translation focusing on identifying the types directive speech act and translation techniques.

Aiming to fill in the gap left by previous studies, this research seeks to identify the subcategory of directive speech act, translation techniques, and translation quality in terms of accuracy, acceptability and readability of directive speech act uttered by Fang Runin in the Dragon Republic novel. This research only focuses on utterances containing directive speech act spoken by Fang Runin or Rin who is the main character within the novel. In analyzing the data, this research employed Bach and Harnish (1979) classification to determine the directive speech act subcategories and Molina and Albir (2002) theory to examine the translation technique. Lastly, this research utilizes Nababan et al (2012) model to assess the translation quality.

2. METHOD

This research employs a descriptive-qualitative approach as it attempts to provide a systemic and factual description of the characteristics and relationships between the phenomena being discussed (Furidha, 2023). The data were taken from the Dragon Republic novel and its Indonesian translation, Republik Naga. In addition, this research also involved raters as sources of data. This research employed document analysis to collect Fang Runin's utterances that contain directive speech act. Furthermore, the collected utterances are further analyzed using Focus Group Discussion method ensuring the validity of the data.

The data in this research consist of Fang Runin's utterances that contain directive speech act indicating the application of a purposive sampling technique. Furthermore, this research classified the data into categories based on the subcategories of directive speech act using Bach and Harnish's (1979) classification and classified the translation techniques referring to Molina and Albir's (2002) theory. Lastly, this research assessed the translation quality in terms of accuracy, acceptability and readability using Nababan's (2012) model.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Result

Subcategories of Directive Speech Act

The findings discovered a total of 152 utterances that contain directive speech act spoken by Fang Runin in the Dragon Republic novel. The utterances are further classified into six subcategories based on Bach and Harnish's (1979) classification. Table 1 shows the frequency of each directive speech act subcategory.

Table 1. Subcategories of Directive Speech Act

No.	Subcategories of Directive Speech Act	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Question	70	46.05%
2.	Requirement	44	28.95%
3.	Requestive	20	13.16%
4.	Prohibitive	7	4.61%
5.	Advisory	7	4.61%
6.	Permissive	4	2.63%
	Total	152	100%

Table 1 reveals that question appears 70 times making it the most dominant subcategory. It is followed by requirement with 44 instances and requestive which appears in 20 occurrences. Furthermore, both prohibitive and advisory appear 7 times, placing them as the fourth most dominant subcategory. Meanwhile, permissive only appears in 4 occurrences, making it as the least dominant subcategory.

Question

According to Bach and Harnish (1979) question involves the speaker's expresses his desire for the hearer to provide him with certain information using speech act. Furthermore, in expressing question, the speaker presumes that the hearer has the ability to answer it. In this study, there are 70 data classified as question making it the most frequent subcategory.

Example 1**ST: “How long have I been out?”**

The utterance is spoken by Rin to Chaghan. Previously, during a mission, she falls unconscious and when she wakes up, she finds herself in a bed with Chaghan next to her. The utterance is classified as a question because Rin uses the utterance as a means to gain information from Chaghan. Thus, it indicates that Rin presumes Chaghan has the ability required to answer her question.

Requirement

Bach and Harnish (1979) defines requirement as a type of directive speech act in which the speaker expresses his demand for the hearer to perform an action. In requirement the speaker must possess a form of power or authority over the hearer. The findings show that there are 44 data classified as requirement, making it the second most abundant subcategory.

Example 2**ST: “Go rally the others”**

Rin utters this line to Unegen, her subordinate in the Cike. The dialogue happens during an assassination mission where Rin spots an enemy and instructs Unegen to rally the other members of her squad. This utterance is categorized as requirement because Rin aims to make Unegen complies by finding the rest of the team. Given their power dynamics in which Rin holds clear authority due to her position as a commander, her utterance carries a force that restricts Unegen’s ability to refuse.

Requestive

According to Bach and Harnish (1979) Requestive is a type of directive speech act in which the speaker expresses his desire to make the hearer perform a specific action. However, unlike requirement, the hearer still has option to refuse the request. In this research, there are 20 occurrences of requestive.

Example 3**ST: “Give me few days”**

Rin addresses this utterance to Vaisra, the commander of Republican Armed Forces. This example is categorized as a requestive because Rin says it to ask for additional time. However, Rin does not hold authority over Vaisra,, making him retains the freedom to comply or refuse.

Prohibitive

According to Bach and Harnish (1979) prohibitive is a type of directive speech act in which restricts the hearer from doing certain action. Similar to requirement, in prohibitive, the speaker needs to have authority over the hearer.

Example 4**ST: “Don’t you patronize me”**

This example falls into the prohibitive directive speech act because Rin forbids the hearer from engaging a specific action which in this case is telling her what to do. Through this line, Rin exerts her authority as a commander, seeking a perlocutionary effect where the speaker stops doing the action.

Advisory

Advisory is a subcategory of directive speech act where the speaker aims to persuade the hearer to do certain action by pointing out that the action will be beneficial for the hearer. The findings revealed that there are 7 data classified as an advisory, making it as the fourth most frequent subcategory alongside prohibitive.

Example 5**ST: “Then we’ll mount that on the ship”**

This example is classified as advisory because Rin intends to influence Nezha’s decision by expressing her belief that the proposed action will benefit the hearer.

Permissive

In permissive, the speaker grants the hearer with permission to perform certain actions. In other words, the utterance serves as a green light to perform the action. In this research, there are 4 occurrences of permissive, making it as the least frequent subcategory.

Example 6**ST: “Go ahead”**

Rin directs this utterance to Nezha. For context, previously Nezha has asked for Rin’s permission to ask a question. This example is categorized as a permissive subcategory. It is because the expressed attitude shows Rin’s giving Nezha permission to speak.

Translation Techniques of Directive Speech Act

In addition to subcategories of directive speech act, the findings also revealed 564 instances of the application of 13 distinct translation techniques. based on the Molina and Albir’s (2002) theory. The frequency of every translation technique is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Translation Techniques of Directive Speech Act

No	Translation Technique	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Established Equivalent	380	67.37%
2.	Variation	68	12.05%
3.	Implication	27	4.78%
4.	Pure Borrowing	22	3.90%
5.	Explication	18	3.19%
6.	Paraphrase	16	2.83%
7.	Compensation	12	2.12%
8.	Discursive Creation	8	1.41%
9.	Literal Translation	6	1.06%
10.	Generalization	3	0.53%
11.	Reduction	2	0.35%
12.	Naturalized Borrowing	1	0.17%
13.	Transposition	1	0.17%
	Total	564	100%

Table 2 reveals that the most common translation technique is established equivalent with 380 instances, followed by variation (68 times), implication (27 times), pure borrowing (22 times), explication (18 times), paraphrase (16 instances), compensation (12 times), discursive creation (8 times), literal translation (6 instances), generalization (3 times), and reduction (2 occurrences). Meanwhile, naturalized borrowing and transposition emerge as the joint least frequent translation technique appearing once respectively.

Established Equivalent

Molina and Albir explains that established equivalent uses expressions or terms acknowledged as an equivalent in the target language. In other words, it uses expressions recognized by dictionaries and widely used in the target language. The finding revealed established equivalent as the most dominant translation technique with 380 instances.

Example 7**ST: “Hold fire”****TT: “Tahan tembakan”**

The utterance is translated employing established equivalent technique. The core meaning of “Hold fire” is to stop firing. The translator applies established equivalent to translate “hold” into “tahan” and “fire” and “tembakan”.

Variation

Variation involves altering linguistic or paralinguistic elements of an utterance that impact linguistic variation including changes in style, social and geographical dialect. Based on the research findings, variation is applied 68 times. This places it as the second most dominant technique.

Example 8**ST: “Where did **you** get that?”****TT: “Dari mana **Anda** mendapatkan itu?”**

In this context, Fang Runin or Rin asks Vaisra about how he managed to retrieve Rin’s former commander trident. The translator applies variation technique to translate “you” into “Anda” instead of other word that have similar meaning such as “kamu” or “kau”.

Implication

Implication is a technique that involves rendering explicit elements within a source text into more implicit translation within the target text. However, the implicit meaning remains traceable in the surrounding context. This study discovered 27 instances of implication.

Example 9

ST: “**Are** they treating you alright?”

TT: “Mereka memperlakukanmu dengan baik?”

This utterance is stated when Rin meets her best friend, Kitay. Rin is surprised with Kitay’s condition, as he looks very thin. The translator employs implication technique to translate the question marker “are” which is removed in the translation. However, this does not affect the meaning because it is common and natural to ask questions directly without using question word such as “apa”.

Pure Borrowing

According to Molina and Albir (2002), pure borrowing is a type of borrowing translation technique in which the translator takes a term or expression directly from the source text as it is, without any modification. In this study, 22 instances of pure borrowing technique were found.

Example 10

ST: “What about **Fuchai** and **Goujian**?”

TT: “Bagaimana dengan **Fuchai** dan **Goujian**?”

In this utterance, the words “Fuchai” and “Goujian” refer to characters in an ancient folklore. The translator employed pure borrowing technique by maintaining the names in the target text. By retaining them, the target text preserves their specific contextual reference.

Explication

Explication is a shift in translation from something implicit in the source text into something explicit in the target text. In other words, explication is a translation technique in which the translator uses a more detailed term or expression to translate something implicit in the source text. This research discovered 18 occurrences of explication technique.

Example 10

ST: “Whose **bodies**?”

TT: “**Mayat** siapa?”

The translator decides to translate the word “bodies” as “mayat” in the target text. It is because in this context, the word “bodies” refers specifically to deceased people. While the word “bodies” is general and could be translated as “tubuh”, “mayat” is the specific word for corpses in Indonesian. Therefore, by using “mayat”, the translator makes the reference to deceased people explicit and easily understood by the reader.

Paraphrase

Paraphrase is a translation technique which involves translating a certain message in different wordings in the target language. According to Yan (2018), in paraphrase, the translator is allowed to add supplement and explanation, but the translation must still carry the same meaning as the original text.

Example 12

ST: “**What do those say?**”

TT: “**Apa arti kata-kata itu?**”

The translator decides to translate the expression “What do those say?” into “Apa arti kata-kata itu?”. The translator uses different wordings in translating the original utterance. If the target language utterance “Apa arti kata-kata itu?” is back translated into the source language, it literally means “What is the meaning of those words?”. By employing paraphrase, the translator preserves the original message while also improving the clarity and naturalness of the translation.

Compensation

Compensation is a translation technique which involves introducing an element of information or style in different spot in the target text. This study discovered 12 instances of compensation.

Example 13

ST: “Where are **they** going?”

TT: “Mereka mau kemana?”

The utterance is an example of a translation applying compensation technique. The translator employs compensation in rendering the pronoun “they” into “mereka”. While both terms carry similar meaning, the target text does not follow the same word placement as that in the source text. In the source text, “they” is placed in the middle of the question. Meanwhile, the target text places “mereka” at the beginning of the sentence.

Discursive Creation

Discursive creation technique involves translating original terms or expressions using a temporary and unpredictable equivalence in the target text. This research discovered 8 occurrences of discursive creation technique usage.

Example 14

ST: “How much agility do **you** get in shallow waters?”

TT: “Selincih apa **mereka** di perairan dangkal?”

The utterance occurs in a shipyard when Rin sees a number of massive battleships with rows of cannon berthed at a pier. In this example, discursive creation is applied “you” into “mereka”. The translation experiences a significant shift in referent because the source text uses the second person pronoun “you” to refer to the hearer, while the target text uses the third person pronoun “mereka” that refer to the warships.

Literal Translation

According to Molina and Albir (2002), using literal translation, the translator renders a word or expression directly without considering the context of the utterance. This study revealed that the translator uses literal technique 6 times in translating Fang Runin’s directive speech acts.

Example 15

ST: “Anyone got a **copper**?”

TT: “Ada yang punya **koin tembaga**?”

In this context, Rin and his subordinates need to pay a local boatman to help them cross a canal. Therefore, the word “copper” refers to a form of low value coin rather than a specific kind of metal. The translator applies the literal translation technique by translating “copper” into “koin tembaga”. While the word “koin” is added to explicitly clarify its reference as a coin, the translator also retains the literal translation of “tembaga” which sounds misplaced and unnatural in the target text.

Generalization

Generalization is a technique in which the translator renders a specific term into a more general and neutral term in the target language. The findings revealed that the translator uses generalization technique 3 times in translating Fang Runin’s directive speech acts.

Example 16

ST: “No, **fuck off**”

TT: “Tidak, **pergi sana**”

The translator applies generalization in the translation of “No, fuck off” into “Tidak, pergi sana”. Generalization is applied to render “fuck off” into “pergi sana” as the translator decides to translate the original utterance using a more neutral expression. The primary difference between the source and target text expressions lies in their level of vulgarity. While the source text uses a rude expression, the target text renders it using a more polite and neutral expression.

Reduction

Reduction is a translation technique involving the reduction of certain information items from the source text when rendering them in the target language. This study found that the translator employ reduction in 2 occasions when translating Fang Runin’s directive speech acts.

Example 17

ST: “Get back, come any closer and I’ll burn you”

TT: “Mundur, kalau kau mendekat, kubakar kau”

Rin directs this utterance to the Empress following her battle with a powerful shaman. In this example, reduction is applied as the translator decides not to translate the modal verb “I’ll” which is a contraction form of “will”. By reducing it, the translator removes the explicit future gap between the Empress’s action and the consequence.

Naturalized Borrowing

According to Molina and Albir (2002), naturalized borrowing is a part of borrowing technique which involves naturalizing or modifying the borrowed terms or expressions. This study only discovered 1 instance of naturalized borrowing.

Example 18

ST: “Then go, take the warhorse, ride north. Go back to your **clan** and warn them”

TT: “Kalau begitu pergilah, Bawa kuda perang itu, pergi ke utara. Kembalilah ke **klan**-mu dan peringatkan mereka.”

The translator employs naturalized borrowing to translate the word “clan” into “klan”. Although, the meaning does not shift, the term experience modification in the target text. The modification happens where the translation changes the consonant “c” into “k”. This adjustment is done to fit the Indonesian spelling rules.

Transposition

Transposition is a technique which involves altering the grammatical category of an expression from the source text to the target text. This study found only 1 instance of transposition, making it the least frequent translation technique

Example 19

ST: “Aratsha, hard right **turn**”

TT: “Aratsha, **belok** tajam ke kanan”

In the example, transposition is used to render “turn” into “belok”. In source text, the word “turn” is categorized as a noun, whereas the translation “belok” is categorized as a verb. Thus, this shift in grammatical category, from a noun to a verb indicates the use of transposition.

Translation Quality of Directive Speech Act

In determining the translation quality, this study applies Nababan’s (2012) translation quality assessment model. This study analyzed 3 aspects following Nababan’s (2012) model, accuracy, acceptability and readability. The data were obtained from the Focus Group Discussion with three raters ensuring the data validity and quality.

Accuracy

Table 3. Translation Quality in terms of Accuracy

No	Translation Quality	Frequency	Percentage	Average Score
1.	Accurate	138	90.79%	2,91
2.	Less Accurate	14	9.21%	
3.	Inaccurate	-	0%	
Total		152	100%	

This study discovered 138 data (90.79%) that are considered accurate and 14 data (9.21%) that are labeled as less accurate. In conclusion, the average score of accuracy of directive speech act translation of Fang Runin’s utterance is 2.91.

A. Accurate

For a translation to be considered accurate, it must achieve the maximum 3 points. It indicates that the translation does not add or delete certain information in the source text. The findings revealed 138 data utterances of accurate translation.

Example 20

ST: “Aratsha, will you watch him?”

TT: “Aratsha, bisa kau awasi dia?”

This translation is categorized as accurate. In this instance, the translator predominantly employs established equivalent in combination with pure borrowing to render the proper name “Aratsha”. This combination fully preserves the meaning and context of the original utterance. Consequently, there

is no apparent shift in the directive speech act subcategory as both versions are classified within the requestive subcategory, specifically as indirect requestive.

B. Less Accurate

A translation can be considered as less accurate if most of the meanings are transferred accurately. However, there is still some meaning distortion and ambiguity or deletion of meaning which negatively impact the overall message. This study identified 14 instances of less accurate translation.

Example 21

ST: "Get to the gates"

TT: "Ayo bergerak ke gerbang"

This utterance is an example of less accurate translation. This is because the use of discursive creation technique, through the addition of the word "Ayo" in the target text. This causes a shift in the subcategory of directive speech act from requirement to requestive. The original utterance does not contain an indicator of invitation, making the word "Ayo" contextually irrelevant. Ultimately, this creates a distortion of meaning that reduces the translation accuracy score to 2, categorizing it as a less accurate translation.

Acceptability

Table 4. Translation Quality in terms of Acceptability

No	Translation Quality	Frequency	Percentage	Average Score
1.	Acceptable	145	95.39%	2.95
2.	Less Acceptable	7	4.61%	
3.	Unacceptable	-	0%	
Total		152	100%	

This study discovered 145 data (95.39%) that are considered acceptable and 7 data (4.61%) that are categorized as less acceptable. As a result, the average score of acceptability of directive speech act translation of Fang Runin's utterance is 2.95.

C. Acceptable

A translation is considered acceptable if it feels natural, employs expressions commonly used in the target language and follows the linguistic norms of the target language. The findings discovered 145 instances of acceptable translation.

Example 22

ST: "Where's your physician? Where?"

TT: "Di mana doktermu? Di mana?"

This utterance is an example of an acceptable translation primarily due to the use of established equivalent technique. The application of established equivalent technique ensures that the translation uses commonly recognized expressions. For instance, the term "physician" is translated into "dokter" which is a widely recognized term for person works as a medical professional.

D. Less Acceptable

A translation is considered less acceptable if it has an issue with the use of technical terms or if the translation has grammatical errors. This study found a total of 7 less acceptable translations.

Example 22

ST: "How much agility do you get in shallow waters?"

TT: "Selincih apa mereka di perairan dangkal?"

This translation is considered less acceptable due to the application of discursive creation. This technique is employed in translating "you" into "mereka". In the target text, the word "mereka" refers to several warships docked at a pier. This is considered as uncommon and unnatural in the target language, because "mereka" is exclusively used to refer to people rather than inanimate objects.

Readability

Table 5. Translation Quality in terms of Readability

No	Translation Quality	Frequency	Percentage	Average Score
1.	High Readability	145	95.39%	2.95
2.	Medium Readability	7	4.61%	
3.	Low Readability	-	0%	
	Total	152	100%	

This study identified a total of 145 data (95.39%) that are considered having high level of readability. Furthermore, this study also found 7 data (4.61%) that are categorized as having medium readability. This results in an average readability score of 2.95.

E. High Readability

In order for a translation to be considered as having a high level of readability, it must receive a perfect score of 3. This means that the translation must be easily understood by the target reader. This study found that 145 occurrences translation of high readability.

Example 22

ST: "So, we've got what, two hours?"

TT: "Jadi, kita punya waktu berapa lama, dua jam?"

This utterance is an example of a high-readability translation as it primarily uses established equivalent and explication techniques. Through established equivalent, the translator translates majority of the utterance using well-recognized Indonesian expressions. In addition, the explication technique is specifically employed in rendering "what" into "waktu berapa lama", clarifying the temporal reference of the original utterance. Consequently, this removes potential ambiguity which directly contributes to the improved readability level.

F. Medium Readability

A translation is considered as having medium level of readability if it only gets 2 for the score. This suggests that the translation is generally understandable but it also contains parts that slightly more difficult to understand. This requires the readers to read it more than once. There are 7 data classified as medium readability.

Example 22

ST: "Are you ever going back to that grotto?"

TT: "Apa kau akan pernah kembali ke gua itu?"

This translation shows medium readability level due to the literal rendering of "ever" as "pernah." Although both function as temporal markers and are often treated as equivalent, "ever" denotes any time, while "pernah" refers specifically to past experience. Since "going back" implies a future possibility, "akan" is used as a future marker—but this creates a contradiction, as "pernah" is past-oriented while "akan" is future-oriented. This contradiction may confuse readers and they require re-reading.

3.2. Discussion

The findings show that the subcategories of directive speech act found in this study follow patterns indicated in Bach and Harnish (1979). Both question and requestive appear when the speaker do not hold authority over the hearer. On the other hand, requirement and prohibitive appear when the speaker holds authority over the hearer. Advisory and permissive work differently from the other subcategories. Advisory depends on the speaker showing that an action will benefit the hearer, while permissive depends on the hearer asking for permission first. This shows that each subcategory does not appear randomly, but depends on the specific relationship and situation between the speaker and the hearer.

In terms of translation technique, established equivalent is the most frequently used in this study. This is in line with Molina and Albir (2002) who explain that established equivalent uses expressions that are already recognized and commonly used in the target language. This technique tends to produce an accurate and highly readable translation. This finding is also supported by Sakulpimolrat (2019), who found that established equivalent is the most dominant technique used in translating directive speech act in *The Little Prince* novel and contributed positively to translation quality in terms of accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Meanwhile, techniques that change the source text more, such as discursive creation and literal translation responsible for the translations that are less accurate, less acceptable, or having medium level of readability. Discursive creation can change the subcategory of an utterance and add meaning that is not in the source text, and can also make a translation sound unnatural. This finding is also supported by Sakulpimolrat (2019), who found that established equivalent is the most dominant technique used in translating directive speech act in *The Little Prince* novel and contributes positively to translation quality in terms of accuracy, acceptability, and readability.

4. CONCLUSION

This research examines the translation of directive speech act uttered by Fang Runin in the *Dragon Republic* novel. The exploration covers the identification of directive speech act subcategory, translation techniques and translation quality in terms of accuracy, acceptability and readability.

This research identified 152 instances of directive speech act uttered by Fang Runin in the *Dragon Republic* novel, classified into six subcategories with question emerges as the most dominant subcategory with 70 data. It is followed by requirement with 44 instances and requestive which appear 20 times. Furthermore, prohibitive appears 7 times similar to advisory. Meanwhile, permissive is the least dominant subcategory with only 4 appearances. In terms of translation technique, this study identified a total of 13 techniques with 564 occurrences. Those techniques are established equivalent, variation, implicitation, pure borrowing, explicitation, paraphrase, compensation, discursive creation, literal translation, generalization, reduction, naturalized borrowing and transposition. Established equivalent is the most dominant technique with 380 instances, whereas the least frequent techniques are natural borrowing and transposition, each appearing only once.

Regarding translation quality, the translation of directive speech acts uttered by Fang Runin in the *Dragon Republic* novel gets an overall score of 2.93. Translation quality is closely related to the translation techniques applied. Certain techniques such as established equivalent, produces good-quality translations. Meanwhile, techniques such as discursive creation and literal translation can often lower translation quality.

Given the limitations of this research, future researchers can address this gap by building on the present findings. For instance, future studies may explore the relationship between politeness theory and directive speech act translation, or examine characters with different backgrounds in order to enrich the discussion of directive speech act translation within this specific novel.

REFERENCES

- Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Communication and speech acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard.
- Bathara, G. W., & Noverino, R. (2023). Analysis of Translation Techniques of Directive Speech Acts in *WALL-E* Film. *JEDu: Journal of English Education*, 3(3), 208-217.
- De Pablos-Ortega, C. (2020). Directive speech acts in English and Spanish filmspeak. *Sociocultural Pragmatics*, 8(1), 105-125. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soprag-2020-0001>
- Furidha, B. W. (2023). Comprehension of the descriptive qualitative research method: A critical assessment of the literature. *Acitya Wisesa: Journal Of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.56943/jmr.v2i4.443>
- Guo, Y., & Yu, H. (2023). Strategies and insights on managing cultural differences in literary translation. *Lecture Notes on Language and Literature*, 6(9), 45-52.
- Handayani, E. P. (2020). Translation Analysis on Directive Speech Acts Found in Youtube Video of Vice Indonesia Entitled: Polemik Poligami di Indonesia: Berbagi Surga. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Studi Amerika*, 26(2), 108-125.
- Molina, L., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta*, 47(4), 498-512. <https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>
- Nababan, M., & Nuraeni, A. & Sumardiono. (2012). Pengembangan model penilaian kualitas terjemahan. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 24(1), 39-57.
- Sakulpimolrat, S. (2019). The analysis of translation techniques and translation quality of directives speech act in the little prince novel. *Prasasti: Journal of Linguistics*, 4(2), 166-179. <https://doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v4i2.33048>
- Sanjaya, P.K., Lumintang, S. F., & Ena, O. T. (2025). Analyzing speech acts in school communication: A study

of Abbott Elementary series. *INTERFERENCE: Journal of Language, Literature, and Linguistics*, 6 (1), 33-49. <https://doi.org/10.26858/interference.v6i1.69559>

Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23