

Original research article

УДК 81'367.32

DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2025-2-84-100

## THE USE OF IMPERATIVES BY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (*ANGKOT*) DRIVERS IN BANDUNG CITY, INDONESIA

**Supian<sup>\*</sup>, Ladinata<sup>1</sup>, R. Dallyono<sup>2</sup>, R. S. Yudistira<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Padjadjaran University, Jatinangor, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author, e-mail: supian@unpad.ac.id

*Received by the editorial office 09.10.2024*

*Revised by the author 29.11.2024*

*Accepted for publication 30.11.2024*

### **Abstract**

**Aim.** This research aims to investigate the variation of imperative mood in dialogic scenes between passengers and drivers in *Angkot*, a popular mode of public transportation in Bandung, Indonesia, by applying syntax and speech act approaches to identify communicative strategies and understand the imperative power of public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers in Bandung City.

**Methodology.** A qualitative approach was applied in this research. The data were collected through audio recordings (with the driver's permission) while traveling on the specified route.

**Results.** This study reveals that *Angkot* drivers predominantly use directive-imperative sentences, with commands (56.84%), advice (14.73%), and invitations (12.63%). These imperative sentences used by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers play a crucial role in regulating and guiding their passenger behavior in the vehicle.

**Research Implications.** The research findings provide valuable insights into the dynamics of imperative sentences in the context of public transportation (*Angkot*) in Bandung City. It offers a comprehensive analysis of the communicative strategies used by drivers, classifying and identifying the types of imperative power, thereby enriching our understanding of discourse in public transportation interactions.

**Keywords:** imperative sentences, public transportation, *Angkot* drivers, communicative strategies, and speech acts

### **For citation:**

Supian, Ladinata, Dallyono, R. & Yudistira, R. S. (2025). The use of imperatives by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers in Bandung city, Indonesia. In: *Key Issues of Contemporary Linguistics*, 2, 84–100. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5075-2025-2-84-100>

Научная статья

## ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ ИМПЕРАТИВОВ ВОДИТЕЛЯМИ ОБЩЕСТВЕННОГО ТРАНСПОРТА («АНГКОТ») В ГОРОДЕ БАНДУНГ (ИНДОНЕЗИЯ)

**Супиан<sup>1\*</sup>, Ладината<sup>1</sup>, Далийоно Р.<sup>2</sup>, Юдистира Р. С.<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Университет Паджаджаран, г. Джатинангор, Республика Индонезия

<sup>2</sup> Индонезийский университет образования, г. Бандунг, Республика Индонезия

\* Корреспондирующий автор, e-mail: supian@unpad.ac.id

Поступила в редакцию 09.10.2024

После доработки 29.11.2024

Принята к публикации 30.11.2024

### Аннотация

**Цель.** Данное исследование направлено на изучение вариации императивного наклонения в диалогических сценах между пассажирами и водителями «Ангкот», популярного вида общественного транспорта в городе Бандунг (Индонезия), с применением синтаксического и речевого подходов для выявления коммуникативных стратегий и понимания императивной силы водителей общественного транспорта в городе Бандунг.

**Процедура и методы.** В этом исследовании был применён качественный подход. Данные были собраны с помощью аудиозаписи (с разрешения водителя) во время поездки по указанному маршруту.

**Результаты.** Данное исследование показало, что водители «Ангкот» преимущественно используют директивно-императивные предложения, среди которых команды (56,84%), советы (14,73%) и приглашения (12,63%). Эти императивные предложения, используемые водителями общественного транспорта, играют важную роль в регулировании и направлении поведения пассажиров в транспортном средстве.

**Теоретическая и/или практическая значимость.** Результаты исследования представляют ценные сведения о динамике императивных предложений в контексте общественного транспорта «Ангкот» в городе Бандунг. Исследование предлагает всесторонний анализ коммуникативных стратегий, используемых водителями, классифицируя и идентифицируя типы императивной силы, что обогащает наше понимание дискурса во взаимодействиях в общественном транспорте.

**Ключевые слова:** императивные предложения, общественный транспорт, водители «Ангкот», коммуникативные стратегии, речевые акты

### Для цитирования:

Использование императивов водителями общественного транспорта («Ангкот») в городе Бандунг (Индонезия) / Супиан, Ладината, Р. Далийоно, Р. С. Юдистира // Вопросы современной лингвистики. 2025. № 2. С. 84–100. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-5075-2025-2-84-100>

### Introduction

In practical implementation, utterances are not only used to convey information. However, its function is to express and achieve particular communication goals in conversation (Savolainen, Klippi, Tykky-

läinen & Launonen [1]; Bhatti & Kharitonova [2]; Dubrovchenko [3]). Furthermore, in a conversation, two or more individuals exchange words, sentences, expressions, information, thoughts, and ideas on a particular topic. The conversation between passengers

and a driver in public transportation is the focus of this research. This phenomenon is attributed to the fact that the interaction between passengers and a driver serves as a manifestation of the dynamic aspects of discourse in practical scenarios.

The communication between passengers and a driver on public transportation is not just about exchanging words. In addition, the role of a driver extends beyond being merely a driver or a provider of transportation services. Instead, a driver also plays a crucial role as a mediator who manages the dynamics of interaction within the vehicle. Communication between passengers and a driver involves sensitivity to individual needs and preferences. Therefore, an analysis of imperative sentences produced by drivers not only about the aspect of commands but also reflects their role as communication mediators in an often dynamic and complex environment. This phenomenon can be found in a public transportation in Indonesia, namely *Angkot*.

*Angkot* is one of the most popular modes of public transportation in Indonesia, especially in Bandung. In fact, *Angkot* is widely used as public transportation for urban or suburban residents in some parts of Indonesia. As a service provider, *Angkot* drivers emerge as a potential party to produce imperative sentences to regulate the situation inside of *Angkot*. Biryulin and Khrakovski [4], in a typologically significant work on imperatives, define imperative sentences as semantically conveying the idea that the speakers is telling the hearers that they intend some action (by a particular agent) to be produced by this information. Its definition incorporates the imperative directive function into its semantic framework, as exemplified by Hamblin [5], Barker [6], Han [7], and Jary & Kissine [8]. Theoretically, the imperative function tends to have a simple definition. We often use imperative sentences to ask or direct others to behave in a certain way, i.e. using directive speech acts (Faisal Septiaji, Safina, Sumarlam [9]). The examples of overtly directive speech acts are

commands and orders. However, it is generally recognized that the category of directive speech acts also includes more conciliatory requests, suggestions, and conciliatory appeals, as well as warnings and advice, prohibitions, and permissions (Haugh & Chang [10]).

Subsequently, imperative sentences are approached with a theoretical analysis of conventionalized indirect requests as demonstrated by Ruytenbeek [11]. His research argues that imperative utterances, where the request is presented as an explication, should involve an additional inferential stage. For instance, Jary and Mikhail [12], based on their analysis, believe that imperatives have a potential to be considered as comparative concepts. Therefore, having a prototypical sentence types helps in forming a holistic concept of directive speech acts. The ability to perform communicative moves (in terms of getting the hearer to act) is possessed by both linguistic and non-linguistic features.

The syntactic representation itself creates a broader perspective on how imperatives are structured and function in achieving imperative power. Clark, Khaled, Kohn, and Armoskaite [13] stated that based on the forms 'let's talk x' and 'let's talk about x', argue that the choice of one form is an example of the affective domain intersecting with grammar. Moreover, imperatives have no direct relationship with non-linguistic aspects of communication, (such as orientation, micro-expressions, or gestures). Scaramino [14] has highlighted that emotional expressions (compared to speech acts) have a less significant contribution to effective and robust communication. In this definition, imperative characteristics can be analyzed independently as a complete character of linguistic elements.

Several scholars have conducted research on the use of imperative in a specific situation (for instance, Auwera, Dobrushina & Goussev [15]; Nurmisliah, Oktariza, & Asridayani [16]; Szeteli, Dóla & Alberti [17]; Amral & Ulfah [18]; Yuniarsi, Supriadin, & Rahmawati [19]; Hariadi, Rahayu, & Hi-

dayat [20]; Rosmalia, Febrianti, Masduqi, & Zen [21]). The data, aims, methods, and objects used in these studies are different. Amral and Ulfah [18], for instance, identified the use of imperative sentence in utterances used by the people from Teluk Raya village, Jambi. The researchers revealed that there are five imperative sentences used by the people from Teluk Raya village: imperative sentence, request imperative, granting permit imperative, ask and order imperative. Moreover, there are also three kinds of speech acts occur in their daily communication: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary.

Meanwhile, Hariadi, Rahayu, and Hidayat [20] investigated the use of imperative sentences in transaction activities in shopping center in Langsa Town Square. They found that the dominant imperative sentence used by people in shopping center is the imperative sentence of request which indicates that the *Langsa* community has the value of politeness. The third study was conducted by Yuniarsi, Supriadin, and Rahmawati [19]. They revealed that Sumbawanese used several type of imperative sentences: command, request, invitation, suggestion, advice, prohibition, and compulsion. However, the participants frequently used the commands imperative sentences in their conversation.

Another study was conducted by Nurmisliah, Oktariza, and Asridayani [16] who analyzed imperative sentences in the *Jangkat Isolek* community. This study shows that each *Isolek* community uses specific conjunctions and particles to indicate imperative sentences in certain contexts. The researcher used three different methods: distributional method, translational method, and referential method. On the other hand, Szeteli, Dóla & Alberti [17], they explain that the use of imperative phrases in Hungarian are able to lead to further applicability as they can be read as instructions and declarations of the speaker's definite position, which is usually motivated by moral considerations.

Although there have been many studies on imperative sentences on a specific situa-

tion. However, the previous studies on imperative sentences mostly only focused on the description of imperative types in particular language (Supian, Ladinata & Dallyono [22]). Additionally, this object and situation of the current research are slightly different from the previous studies. The current research focused on an analysis of imperative sentences used by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers. This research is worth analyzing since *Angkot* is the famous transportation used by Indonesian. Therefore, to fill the gap in the previous studies, this research aims to outline some general and specific forms of imperative power produced by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers in Bandung City. Additionally, syntax and speech act approaches was applied in this research. Therefore, communicative strategies in delivering imperatives can be clearly identified. Hopefully, well-constructed imperatives can effectively create communicative events understood by both parties. This study also seeks to investigate the classification and types of imperative power and dominant actual discourse expressed by public transportation drivers in Bandung City.

## Literature Review

### Imperative

Imperatives make the recipient of the message take an action (Aikhenvald [23]; Biryulin & Khrakovski [4]; Searle [24]). In daily usage, imperatives are considered similar to commands. Theoretically, imperatives are linguistic categories, while commands serve as parameters; thus, the structure of imperatives often extends beyond mere commands.

The necessity of public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers in giving instruction to passengers is the focus of this study. Based on the perfunctory analysis, the driver uses a type of speech that is oriented to make passengers perform actions. It has become a common method that speech with performative aspects using imperatives creates obligations for the recipient (Alston [25]; Kamp [26];

Searle [27]; Truckenbrodt<sup>1</sup>). Besides, modal verbs can be used to strengthen warning statements and also to create a less forceful directive force in warnings and requests.

It should be noted that semantic composition will determine the content or propositions that need to be actualized for imperatives to be fulfilled. The use of a specific composition (syntax or semantic structure) in certain clause type systems will operate three main features. These features, as universal considerations, form a closed system and are always categorized as specific forces (Sadock & Zwicky [28]). The concept of force in imperatives is not appropriate to be referred to as illocution. In terms of clause types, it is better to adopt terms, such as sentential force (Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet [29]) or, in other terms, referred to as sentence mood (Reis [30]).

### **Imperative Power**

The previous studies (Baker [31]; Cheng [32]; Han [33]; Rivero & Terzi [34]; Rizzi [35]) have proven that the power of clauses is formally represented in syntax. The function of imperative power is to add properties to the recipient's set of requirements. Therefore, the first requirement for claiming that theory is some explanation on how grammar supports sentences to form specific speech acts. Sometimes, imperative power is not directly represented in syntax and is not implemented through specific morphemes or certain elements (Zanuttini, Pak & Portner [36]). This research conducted from that assumption.

Jary and Mikhail [12] believe that the imperative has the potential to be considered as a comparative concept, therefore it has a prototypical sentence type for performing a holistic concept of directive speech acts. The ability to perform communicative moves (in terms of making the recipient act) is possessed by both linguistic and non-linguistic features. The syntactic representation itself

creates a broader perspective on how imperatives are structured and function in achieving imperative power. Clark, Khaled, Kohn, and Armoskaite [13], based on the forms 'let's talk x' and 'let's talk about x', argue that the choice of one form is an example of the affective domain intersecting with grammar. Moreover, imperatives have no direct relationship with non-linguistic aspects of communication (such as orientation, micro-expressions, or gestures). Scarantino [14] has highlighted that emotional expressions (compared to speech acts) have a less significant contribution to effective and robust communication. Based on this definition, imperative characteristics can be analyzed independently as a complete feature of linguistic elements.

### **Imperatives in Speech Act**

The theory of speech acts is well-known in the field of linguistics. According to Formanovskaya [37], within the framework of linguistic philosophy, speech act focuses on the goals and motives of speakers. Austin [38] in her book entitled *How to do Things with Words* considered speech act as a concept that has three levels: locative, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. Locative act (locution) is a stage of linguistic expression by directly uttering words, phrases, and sentences in accordance with their meaning.

The illocutionary act is a part of pragmatic component that reflect the communicative purpose or intention of the speaker when expressing a statement. This type of action involves various utterances; for instance, statements, orders, questions, suggestions, and commands. In speech act theory, the illocutionary act refers to the communicative purpose that the speaker wants to achieve through his utterance, which often has more meaning.

Lastly, the perlocutionary act serves to intentionally influence the addressee to achieve an outcome. For example, the result of uttering a warning such as "Be careful, the dog is aggressive" will be a perlocution – the conclusion: "We will not go there because the dog

<sup>1</sup> Truckenbrodt, H. (2009). *Performatives and agreement*. Berlin: ZAS(Unpublished manuscript).

seems dangerous” (Austin [38]). Another example is “It will rain tomorrow” will make the addressee conclude that “We should bring an umbrella or rain coat tomorrow”. It is important to note that the three personal actions occur simultaneously, not successively, and the distinction between them is necessary for methodological purposes.

Speech act theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the complex dynamics of communication. By understanding the different layers of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, scholars and linguists gain insight into the intentional aspects of linguistic expression. Moreover, this theoretical foundation encourages a nuanced exploration of how speakers convey not only literal meaning but also underlying motives and communicative goals.

Materials and Methods

Participants

The participants reported on this research were eight public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers in Bandung City. The *Angkot* drivers were male with an age range of 30–40 years old. They have experienced being *Angkot* drivers for more than 10 years.

Data Collection Method

The data for this research were collected through audio recording (with the driver’s permission) while traveling on the specified route. The recording duration of each driver is different, as seen in the following table 1.

The table 1 above shows the recording duration of each driver in a different situation in public transportation (*Angkot*). The recording process has been done from March 6<sup>th</sup> – July 3<sup>rd</sup> in 2022. The shortest recording duration was on March 11<sup>th</sup>, lasting only 00:02:32 minutes. Meanwhile, the longest recording duration was on May 13<sup>th</sup>, lasting for 00:16:46 minutes.

The recording duration varied for each public transportation (*Angkot*), depending on the situation inside the vehicle. If the atmosphere inside the vehicle was conducive; for instance, the absence of disruptive noise and the driver frequently communicate with their passengers, the recording duration would be extended. On the other hand, if the atmosphere inside the vehicle is not conducive; for instance, a high level of background noise and lack of communication between the driver and passengers, the audio recording will be terminated.

Table 1 / Таблица 1

Duration of audio recording data with *Angkot* drivers / Продолжительность аудиозаписей с водителями *Анγκота* (маршрутка)

Number	Date	Duration	Code
1	March 6 <sup>th</sup> 2022	00:02:50	Data_A
2	March 9 <sup>th</sup> 2022	00:13:24	Data_B
3	March 11 <sup>th</sup> 2022	00:02:32	Data_C
4	March 22 <sup>th</sup> 2022	00:03:35	Data_D
5	April 21 <sup>th</sup> 2022	00:13:20	Data_E
6	May 13 <sup>th</sup> 2022	00:16:46	Data_F
7	June 6 <sup>th</sup> 2022	00:15:24	Data_G
8	July 3 <sup>rd</sup> 2022	00:10:38	Data_H

Source: Compiled by the author based on the results of travel by *angkot* (minibus) from Terminal Ledeng to Terminal Cicaheum in Bandung, West Java.

Источник: Составлено авторами по итогам поездок на *анγκоте* (маршрутке) от остановки Ledeng до остановки Cicaheum в г. Бандунг, провинция Западная Ява



### **Data Analysis Technique**

The data were initially transcribed to identify imperative statements from public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers. The identification aimed to discover the strength of variables by grouping imperatives into specific characteristics. The identification is based on Condoravdi and Lauer [39], who categorize the strength of variables into Group I: Directives (commands, warnings, requests, advice, and pleas); Group II: Use of desire type (well-wishes, curses, address-less wishes, absent wishes); Group III: Permission and invitation (permission/concession, offers, invitations); Group IV: Disintegrated advice.

Furthermore, the syntactic approach towards imperative started by defining the type of imperative clauses. Therefore, clause-type analysis was applied for defining imperative clause. It is in line with Bach and Harnish [40] and Sadock and Zwicky [28]. This is undertaken to obtain the specific illocutionary force from the actual speech produced by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers.

Lastly, the imperative power was analyzed by conducting an analysis of surface structure and examining the abstract elements of imperative clauses. This analysis was done to complement the syntactic approach used in this research. The use of surface structure analysis for imperatives has been done by Downes [41]. This research follows the respective stages. The analysis of the abstract elements of imperative clauses is done by using two analyses of imperative clause structure: the CP hypothesis (Chomsky [42]; Koopman [43]; Koster [44]) and the FP hypothesis (Flagg [45]; Pollock [46; 47]; Rupp<sup>1</sup>).

### **Results**

In this research, we discuss a multilayered analysis of the imperative power variables from the speech of public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers in Bandung City. Impera-

tive forms are categorized based on their function and structural approach. There is a common understanding that imperative can take the form of straightforward statements in which a speaker asks or directs the interlocutor to perform or take a specific action. This research departs from the analysis of the strength of variables from the data that has been collected. The analysis of these findings is presented in the subtopics below.

### **Imperative Power Variable**

In this context, public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers play a dominant role as instructors to passengers. Therefore, the discourse sequence will always involve instructions from the driver to the passengers to perform certain actions and to call for actions in specific situations. Public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers tend to produce imperatives that consist of illocutionary force. Categories and frequencies of variable strengths in driver statements have been identified. Table 2 below has provides a tabulation of the distribution of each category.

The table above indicates the pattern of occurrences of the imperative power variable. The imperative power is divided into four categories: Directives, Wish-type uses, Permission and Invitation, and Disintegrated advice. The most frequently occurring utterances are in Group I: Directives, accounting for 76 utterances. The second common occurring utterances are in Group III: Permission and invitation, accounting for 16 utterances. Followed by Group II: Wish-type uses with only 3 utterances. Meanwhile, for Group IV: Disintegrated advice, there is no identifiable data.

### **Discussion**

From the analysis data, it can be seen that there are three forms of imperatives are most frequently used: commands (56.84%), advice (14.73%), and invitations (12.63%). The frequency of each imperative group is as follows: Group I (76 utterances), Group II (3 utterances), Group III (16 utterances), and Group IV (no identifiable data). The direc-

<sup>1</sup> Rupp, L. (1999). *Aspects of the Syntax of English Imperative* [PhD dissertation]. Essex (Unpublished).

Table 2 / Таблица 2

Pattern of Occurrence of Imperative Power Variables / Модель возникновения императивных переменных власти

	Data								Total	Percentage (%)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
Group I: Directives										
• Command		3	2	2	17	16	8	6	54	56.84%
• Warning				1	2	3			6	6.31%
• Request		1							1	1.05%
• Advice					4	3	4	3	14	14.73%
• Plea		1							1	1.05%
Group II: Wish-type uses										
• Well-wish	1		1						2	2.10%
• Curse										
• Addressee-less wish				1					1	1.05%
• Absent wish										
Group III: Permission and invitation										
• Permission/concession		3		1					4	4.21%
• Offer										
• Invitation					5	2	3	2	12	12.63%
Group IV										
• Disintegrated advice										
Total	1	8	3	5	28	24	15	11	95	100%

tive-imperative form is the most dominantly expressed by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers.

The dominance of Group I (comprising commands (56.84%), advice (14.73%), warnings (6.31%), and requests (1.05%)) accounts

for a total percentage of 78.93%. This data indicates that the speaker intends to make the recipient to perform specific actions related to the services or use of public transportation (*Angkot*). Examples of each form can be illustrated as follows:

Data_E (3)	<i>tutup pantona teh!</i> [close the door ma'am!]	command
Data_D (2)	<i>tong waka kaluar eta tanganna, bahaya</i> don't take your hands out, it's dangerous	warning
Data_E (12)	<i>turunna di payun wae meh teu macet</i> [Wait a few minutes before getting off so you won't be stuck at the traffic]	advice
Data_B (1)	<i>tiasa geser teh?</i> [please, can you move a bit miss?]	request
Data_B (4)	<i>punten pisan, pengker tiasa hiji deui</i> [I apologize, one more person can be at the back]	plea

As we can see above, the predominant use of directive-imperative indicates a specific pressing manner. It is not fair to define

the pressing manner solely as an expression of commands. Regarding to this manner, this research confirms the previous research con-



ducted by Osipchuk [48] that the construction most frequently used to highlight easily performed specific information by the interlocutor is a command. However, the data patterns showed that it can be also identified that public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers attempt to demonstrate variable imperative power proportionally.

This research finding contradicts with the previous research conducted by Rahayu, Hariadi, and Hidayat [20]. They revealed that people in *Langsa* Town Square often used the imperative sentence of request which suggests that the *Langsa* community has the value of politeness. On the other hand, the current research validates the research conducted by Yuniarsi, Supriadin, and Rahmawati [19]. They disclosed that Sumbawanese people frequently used the imperative sentences as command in their conversation.

The difference in results between these studies may be attributed to various factors, including variations in research object, research participants, the location of the research, and changes in societal lifestyles over time. Therefore, despite the different results, the previous research can provide an

overview of the use of imperative sentences in different occasions. It is important to recognize the dynamic nature of language use and consider the evolving context that can contribute to variations in research findings over time.

This heterogeneity is combined with complementary forms that indirectly refer to the characteristics of imperatives and propositions. It is important to balance the content and dynamic effects of updated information and instructions to be followed by individuals. It has become a common phenomenon that the use of directives is the speaker's attempt to make the interlocutor perform a specific action or represents the speaker's desires; but it can also be a combination of both elements. Public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers can be considered to apply a combination of the two fundamental considerations of directives as introduced by Searle [24].

We also need to discuss the use of imperatives categorized as Wish-type uses. This type imperatives type include well-wishes, curses, addressee-less wishes, and absent wishes.

Data_C (2)	... <i>sing ati-ati, salamet di jalan teh</i>	well-wish
	... <i>be careful, take care on the road</i> miss	
Data_D (5)	... <i>eta kegiatan saya mah, mudah-mudahan mangpaat</i>	addressee-less wish
	that's my activities, hopefully it will be useful	

According to the data, public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers also use Group II (Wish-type uses) in their speech. There are only two types of wish-type uses that can be identified: well-wishes and addressee-less wishes. In practical uses, wish-type uses are set aside as the main imperative construction. However, the forms of wish-type uses can be derived from the concept of imperatives (see Kaufmann [49]; Schmerling [50]).

From the examples above, we can see that the imperative nature in these forms does not force the interlocutor or recipient to perform or act upon something. The recipient is treated as someone who does not have the power to do anything about the wishes ex-

pressed by the speaker. Well-wishing forms, as indicated by the data, have a specific to have a good situation. The recipient is asked (not explicitly stated) to accept the wish because it is generally acknowledged as a positive gesture in society. On the other hand, wishes without a recipient are not directed at any specific interlocutor. **Data\_D (5)** indicates that the information is intended to be understood by a particular party. We can assume that it is a general or public consideration, so the speaker has no obligation to specify the intended party.

Theoretically, these findings are in line with research conducted by Auwera, Dobrushina & Goussev [15]. This is support

that expressions of wishes have a future feel. For instance, “... [hopefully it’s useful]” is conveyed by the recipient to make a future situation a reality. It is a wish, but the recipient is indirectly expected to make it true. Therefore, considering the wish-imperative patterns identified in the data, this research indicates that it is crucial to stigmatize wish-

type uses a directive force by disregarding the literal meaning of the word ‘wish’. It is conceivable that if someone ignores expressions as shown by **Data\_C (2)**, then they will be socially sanctioned. Hence, once a wish expression is produced, the recipient has an obligation to consider it as propositional content.

Data_B (3)	... <i>teu nanaon turun di dieu tapi bahaya loba motor</i>	permission
	... <b>you can get off here</b> , but there are many motorcycles, so be careful	
Data_E (15)	... <i>hayu bade ka Ledeng?</i>	invitation
	... <b>let’s go</b> , want to go to Ledeng?	

In order to provide information, public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers also use variable power which categorized as group III (permission / concession, offers, and invitations). The analysis showed that there are only two structures: permission and invitation. Meanwhile offering could not be identified in the data. Permission and invitation in the data indicate that the spokesperson is not actually presenting something to happen. The nuance is more related to communicating the expectations of the recipient of the message. **Data\_B (3)** is a manifestation of what most people in Indonesia are asking. By giving permission, the recipient is allowed to do or act something, as there has been a potential desire of the recipient before (see Condoravdi & Lauer [39]).

In the context of the variable power of the imperative, this research emphatically states that in trying to provide information and direct passengers to do something are mostly realized through directive constructions.

The directive aspects is not implemented by using offers, absent-wishes, and disintegrated wishes in the speech of public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers.

Clause Type and Form of Imperative Type System

In grammar, it is common to categorize utterances into interrogatives, exclamations, declaratives, imperatives, and so on. Since this research focuses on imperative utterances, the clause-type system of the imperative always considered independent of its particular usage. The previous analysis has shown that group I (directive) is the dominant variable force in the data. However, there are three types of actual speech that are dominantly spoken by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers: commands (56.84%), advice (14.73%), and invitations (12.63%).

The analysis of the clause type system in the actual speech types can be showed as follows.

• ... <i>kurang ongkosna !</i>	
... The payment is insufficient!	
... Sorry, but your payment is insufficient!	order
• ... <i>cek abdi mah turunna di payun we!</i>	
... I think it’s better to get off in front!	
... My suggestion is to get off in front!	advice
• ... <i>hayu ka Ledeng !</i>	
... Let’s go to Ledeng !	
‘ ... Let us take this <i>Angkot</i> to Ledeng!’	invitation

Each actual realization of particular form type in actual speech has a specific functional problem. Based on their form types, all utterances are categorized as sequences. Mostly, the actual type of utterance will be based on the semantic characteristics of the sentence. The usage without a verb (as indicated by the first sentence above) and without a subject is a typical imperative construction.

### Conclusion

In this context, public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers have a dominant role as instructors to their passengers. Therefore, the conversational sequences will always include commands from the driver to the passengers to do or act something and call for action in certain situations. The imperative sentences used by public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers play a crucial role in regulating and guiding their passenger behavior in the vehicle. Therefore, this research explores some general considerations and specific ideas about the variable imperative power of public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers in Bandung City.

As stated in the findings, the predominant use of directive-imperative indicates a specific sense of urgency. It is not fair to define urgency solely as an expression of command. The sense of urgency is situated within the core-context of related information. This analysis emphasizes that imperative sentences serve not only as explicit commands but also convey urgency within a broader context, highlighting the interconnected nature of linguistic expressions and the underlying information dynamics in the communication between public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers and passengers.

It is a common phenomenon that the use of directives in the speaker's attempt to make the interlocutor conduct a specific action or represents the speaker's desire; however, it can also be a combination of both elements. Public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers can be considered to apply a combination of the two fundamental consideration of directives. Additionally, these *Angkot* drivers utilize Group

II (wish-type uses) in their speech, featuring only two wish-type uses in their speech: well-wishes and addressee-less wishes.

In conclusion, public transportation (*Angkot*) drivers tend to use directive-imperative sentences which indicate a specific and pressing manner to their passengers. These imperative sentences of command frequently prompt passengers to perform specific actions according to the driver's wishes. Simultaneously, *Angkot* drivers also prioritize the comfort and safety of their passengers by uttering imperative sentences of advice. The interaction phenomenon between *Angkot* drivers and their passengers highlights the significant role of imperative sentences in shaping the dynamics of interaction in actual discourse. It also emphasizes that the diverse nature of communication that is able to occur within the context of public transportation (Eslami, Larina & Pashmforoosh [51]).

There are both theoretical and practical significant points of this current study as follows.

### Theoretical Significance

This study contributes to extending the knowledge of the imperative mood with regard to speech acts. The interpretation of the findings in the light of existing theories of language use and pragmatics provides a valuable insight into the fact that the orientation toward imperative sentences within a particular sociolinguistic context can be explained.

In addition, the results of this research provide a unique perspective on discourse dynamics in public transportation settings. It reveals the linguistic intricacies of how imperative sentences function as communicative tools. It thereby enriches the field of discourse analysis and its applications in everyday interactions.

Meanwhile, this study also underscores the importance of cultural context in language use. They demonstrate how local practices and social norms influence the deployment of imperatives, contributing to the broader understanding of language variation in diverse cultural settings.

For future researchers, this study offers significant insights and a new groundwork for future investigations into the use of imperatives in other public transportation systems or different cultural contexts. It opens a different landscape for comparative studies that could further explore the implications of imperative usage across various languages and societies globally.

### Practical Significance

The insights gained from this study can inform public transportation authorities and drivers to reform the city's regulations for more effective and convenient traffic and transportation in Bandung and might be replicated elsewhere. In addition, such in-

formation is expected to facilitate smoother interactions can lead to improved passenger experiences.

In addition, the findings can serve as a basis for developing training programs for *Angkot* drivers. By focusing on effective use of language, drivers can be equipped with communicative skills to enhance passenger engagement and compliance with safety regulations.

Finally, the research highlights the need for policies that consider the communicative practices of public transportation drivers. Such policies could promote better interaction between drivers and passengers, fostering a more cooperative and respectful travel environment.

### REFERENCES

1. Savolainen, I., Klippi, A., Tykkyläinen, T. & Launonen, K. (2020). Linguistic and temporal resources of pre-stored utterances in everyday conversations. In: *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 36 (3), 195–214. DOI: 10.1177/0265659020950388.
2. Bhatti, N. V. & Kharitonova, E. Yu. (2024). Means of expressing politeness in speech acts in Indo-European languages (based on Russian, English, German and Urdu). In: *Key Issues of Contemporary Linguistics*, 4, 6–17. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2024-4-6-17 (in Russ.).
3. Dubrovchenko, E. M. (2023). Reactions to changes in communicative distance in English communication. In: *Key Issues of Contemporary Linguistics*, 4, 53–62. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2023-4-53-62 (in Russ.).
4. Biryulin, L. A. & Xrakovski, V. S. (2001). Imperative sentences: theoretical problems. In: Xrakovski, V. S., ed. *Typology of imperative constructions*. Munich: Lincom, pp. 3–50.
5. Hamblin, C. L. (1987). *Imperatives*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
6. Barker, S. J. (2004). *Renewing meaning: a speech-act theoretic approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
7. Han, C.-H. (2000). *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in universal grammar*. New York: Garland.
8. Jary, M. & Kissine, M. (2014). *Imperatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Faisal Septiaji, Safina Rihhadatul'aisy Sudibiyo & Sumarlam (2023). Analisis Bentuk dan Fungsi Kalimat Imperatif Dalam Film Top Gun: Maverick. In: *Translation and Linguistics (Transling)*, 3 (1), 38–48. DOI: 10.20961/transling.v3i01.67783.
10. Haugh, M. & Chang, W. M. (2019). Indexical and Sequential Properties of Criticisms in Initial Interactions: Implications for Examining (Im) Politeness across Cultures. In: *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23 (4), 904–929. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-2019-23-4-904-929.
11. Ruytenbeek, N. (2019). Indirect requests, relevance, and politeness. In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, 142, 78–89. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2019.01.007.
12. Jary, M. & Mikhail, K. (2016). When terminology matters: the imperative as a comparative concept. In: *Linguistics*, 54 (1), 119–148. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2015-0039.
13. Clark, M., Khaled, N., Kohn, M. & Armoskaite, S. (2019). Let's talk emotions: a case study on affective grammar. In: *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 4 (1), article no. 20. DOI: 10.5334/gjgl.678.
14. Scarantino, A. (2017). How to do things with emotional expressions: the theory of affective pragmatics. In: *Psychological Inquiry*, 28 (2–3), 165–185. DOI: 10.1080/1047840X.2017.1328951.
15. Auwera, J. van der, Dobrushina, N. & Goussev, V. (2005). Imperative-hortative systems. In: Haspelmath, M., ed. *The World Atlas of language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 286–289.

16. Nurmisliah, Oktariza, D. & Asridayani (2017). Syntactic analysis of imperative sentence in Jambi Malay Language Jangkat isolect. In: *Krinok: Jurnal Linguistik Budaya*, 2 (2), 15–22. DOI: 10.36355/krinok.v2i2.138.
17. Szeteli, A., Dóla, M. & Alberti, G. (2019). Pragmasemantic analysis of the Hungarian inferential: evidential expression *szertint*. In: *Studies in Polish Linguistics*, Special Volume 1, 207–225. DOI: 10.4467/23005920SPL.19.013.10993.
18. Amral, S. & Ulfah, S. D. (2020). Analisis Kalimat Imperatif Pada Tuturan Masyarakat Desa Teluk Raya Kecamatan Kumpeh Kabupaten Muaro Jambi (Kajian Pragmatik). In: *Aksara: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 3 (2), 232–242.
19. Yuniarsi, N., Supriadin, S. & Rahmawati, R. (2020). An Analysis of Imperative Sentences in Sumbawane. In: *Linguistics and ELT Journal*, 7 (1), 1–9. DOI: 10.31764/leltj.v7i1.999.
20. Hariadi, J., Rahayu, T. & Hidayat, M. T. (2022). Analisis Pemakaian Kalimat Imperatif Dalam Proses Jual Beli Di Pusat Perbelanjaan (Langsa Town Square). In: *Jurnal Samudra Bahasa*, 5 (2), 39–48. DOI: 10.33059/jsb.v5i2.6411.
21. Rosmalia, R., Febrianti, Y., Masduqi, H. & Zen, E. L. (2023). An Analysis of Imperative Sentences Uttered by The Education Office in Indonesia. In: *JoLLA: Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts*, 3 (2), 311–322. DOI: 10.17977/um064v3i22023p311-322.
22. Supian, Ladinata & Dallyono, R. (2024). *Russian Imperative: Semantic, Structural and Pragmatic Features*. Bandung: CV Balatin Putera Puteri.
23. Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2010). *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
24. Searle, J. R. (1975). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In: Gunderson, K. (ed.). *Language, mind and knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 344–369. (Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science. Vol. 7).
25. Alston, W. P. (2000). *Illocutionary acts and sentence meaning*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
26. Kamp, H. (1974). Free choice permission. In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 74 (1), 57–74. DOI: 10.1093/aristotelian/74.1.57.
27. Searle, J. R. (1964). How to derive “ought” from “is”. In: *Philosophical Review*, 73 (1), 43–58. DOI: 10.2307/2183201.
28. Sadock, J. & Zwicky, A. (1985). Speech act distinctions in syntax. In: Shopen, T. (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 155–196.
29. Chierchia, G. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2000). *Meaning and Grammar: An Introduction to Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
30. Reis, M. (1999). On sentence types in German: An enquiry into the relationship between grammar and pragmatics. In: *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis*, 4 (2), 195–236.
31. Baker, C. L. (1970). Notes of the description of English questions. In: *Foundations of Language*, 6 (2), 197–219.
32. Cheng, L. (1991). *On the Typology of wh-questions: PhD Dissertation*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy.
33. Han, C. H. (1998). *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in Universal Grammar: PhD Dissertation in Linguistics*. Philadelphia.
34. Rivero, M. L. & Terzi, A. (1995). Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood. In: *Journal of Linguistics*, 31 (2), 301–322. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226700015620.
35. Rizzi, L. (1990). Speculations on verb-second. In: Mascaró, J. & Nespor, M., eds. *Grammar in Progress*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 137–152.
36. Zanuttini, R., Pak, M. & Portner, P. (2012). A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 30, 1231–1274. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-012-9176-2.
37. Formanovskaya, N. I. (2007). *Speech interaction: communication and pragmatics*. Moscow, IKAR (in Russ.).
38. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
39. Condoravdi, C. & Lauer, S. (2012). Imperatives: meaning and illocutionary force. In: Piñón, Ch., ed. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 9. Paris: Université Paris, pp. 37–58.
40. Bach, K. & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
41. Downes, W. (1977). The imperative and pragmatics. In: *Journal of Linguistics*, 13 (1), 77–97.



42. Chomsky, N. (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
43. Koopman, H. (1984). *The syntax of verbs: from verb-movement rules in the Kru Languages to universal grammar*. Doctoral Thesis. Dordrecht: Foris.
44. Koster, J. (1975). Dutch as an SOV language. In: *Linguistic Analysis*, 1 (2), 111–136.
45. Flagg, E. (2001). “You” can’t say that: restrictions on overt subjects in the English imperative. In: Andronis, M., Ball, Ch., Elston, H. & Neuvel, S. (eds.). *CLS 37: The main session. Papers from the 37th meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Vol. 1*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 161–174.
46. Pollock, J.-Y. (1989). Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. In: *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20 (3), 365–424.
47. Pollock, J.-Y. (1997). Notes on clause structure. In: Haegeman, L., ed. *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 237–279.
48. Osipchuk, A. E. (2020). Grammatical Means of Expressing the Semantics of Imperative in the Speech Genre “Command”. In: *Nauchnyi dialog (Scientific Dialogue)*, 1, 141–157. DOI: 10.24224/2227-1295-2020-1-141-157 (in Russ.).
49. Kaufmann, M. (2012). *Interpreting imperatives*. New York: Springer. (Series: Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Vol. 88). DOI: 10.1007/978-94-007-2269-9.
50. Schmerling, S. (1982). How imperatives are special and how they aren’t. In: Robinson, S., Kevin, T. & Robert, C., eds. *Papers from the Parasession on Nondeclaratives: Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Press, pp. 202–218.
51. Eslami, Z. R., Larina, T. V. & Pashmforoosh, R. (2023). Identity, politeness and discursive practices in a changing world. In: *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 27 (1), 7–38. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-34051.

## ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Linguistic and temporal resources of pre-stored utterances in everyday conversations / I. Savolainen, A. Klippi, T. Tykkyläinen, K. Launonen // *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*. 2020. Vol. 36. Iss. 3. P. 195–214. DOI: 10.1177/0265659020950388.
2. Бхатти Н. В., Харитоновна Е. Ю. Способы выражения вежливости в речевых актах в индоевропейских языках (на материале русского, английского, немецкого и урду) // *Вопросы современной лингвистики*. 2024. № 4. С. 6–17. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2024-4-6-1.
3. Дубровченко Е. М. Реакции на изменение коммуникативной дистанции в англоязычном общении // *Вопросы современной лингвистики*. 2023. № 4. С. 53–62. DOI: 10.18384/2949-5075-2023-4-53-62.
4. Biryulin L. A., Xrakovski V. S. Imperative sentences: theoretical problems // *Typology of imperative constructions* / ed. V. S. Xrakovski. Munich: Lincom, 2001. P. 3–50.
5. Hamblin C. L. Imperatives. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987. 262 p.
6. Barker S. J. *Renewing meaning: a speech-act theoretic approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004. 325 p.
7. Han C.-H. *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in universal grammar*. New York: Garland, 2000. 263 p.
8. Jary M., Kissine M. *Imperatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. 336 p.
9. Faisal Septiaji, Safina Rihhadatulaisy Sudibiyo, Sumarlam. Analisis Bentuk dan Fungsi Kalimat Imperatif Dalam Film Top Gun: Maverick // *Translation and Linguistics (Transling)*. 2023. Vol. 3. No. 1. P. 38–48. DOI: 10.20961/transling.v3i01.67783.
10. Хо М., Чанг В. М. Индексальные и последовательные свойства критических замечаний в начале коммуникации: подходы к изучению (не)вежливости в кросс-культурном аспекте (Indexical and Sequential Properties of Criticisms in Initial Interactions: Implications for Examining (Im) Politeness across Cultures) // *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. 2019. Vol. 23. № 4. С. 904–929. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-2019-23-4-904-929.
11. Ruytenbeek N. Indirect requests, relevance, and politeness // *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2019. Vol. 142. P. 78–89. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2019.01.007.
12. Jary M., Mikhail K. When terminology matters: the imperative as a comparative concept // *Linguistics*. 2016. Vol. 54. Iss. 1. P. 119–148. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2015-0039.
13. Let’s talk emotions: a case study on affective grammar / M. Clark, N. Khaled, M. Kohn, S. Armoskaite // *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*. 2019. Vol. 4 (1). Article no. 20. DOI: 10.5334/gjgl.678.



14. Scarantino A. How to do things with emotional expressions: the theory of affective pragmatics // *Psychological Inquiry*. 2017. Vol. 28. Iss. 2-3. P. 165–185. DOI: 10.1080/1047840X.2017.1328951.
15. Auwera J. van der, Dobrushina N., Goussev, V. Imperative-hortative systems // *The World Atlas of language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. P. 294–296.
16. Nurmisliah, Oktariza D., Asridayani. Syntactic analysis of imperative sentence in Jambi Malay Language Jangkat isoelect // *Krinok: Jurnal Linguistik Budaya*. 2017. Vol. 2. Iss. 2. P. 15–22. DOI: 10.36355/krinok.v2i2.138.
17. Szeteli A., Dóla M., Alberti G. Pragmasemantic analysis of the Hungarian inferential: evidential expression *szerint* // *Studies in Polish Linguistics*. 2019. Special Volume 1. P. 207–225. DOI: 10.4467/23005920SPL.19.013.10993.
18. Amral S., Ulfah S. D. Analisis Kalimat Imperatif Pada Tuturan Masyarakat Desa Teluk Raya Kecamatan Kumpoh Kabupaten Muaro Jambi (Kajian Pragmatik) // *Aksara: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. 2020. Vol. 3. No. 2. P. 232–242.
19. Yuniarsi N., Supriadin S., Rahmawati R. An Analysis of Imperative Sentences in Sumbawanese // *Linguistics and ELT Journal*. 2020. Vol. 7. No. 1. P. 1–9. DOI: 10.31764/eltj.v7i1.999.
20. Hariadi J., Rahayu T., Hidayat M. T. Analisis Pemakaian Kalimat Imperatif Dalam Proses Jual Beli Di Pusat Perbelanjaan (Langsa Town Square) // *Jurnal Samudra Bahasa*. 2022. Vol. 5. No. 2. P. 39–48. DOI: 10.33059/jsb.v5i2.6411.
21. An Analysis of Imperative Sentences Uttered by The Education Office in Indonesia / R. Rosmalia, Y Febrianti, H. Masduqi, E. L. Zen // *JoLLA: Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts*. 2023. Vol. 3. No. 2. P. 311–322. DOI: 10.17977/um064v3i22023p311-322.
22. Supian, Ladinata, Dallyono R. Russian Imperative: Semantic, Structural and Pragmatic Features. Bandung: CV Balatin Putera Puteri, 2024. 224 p.
23. Aikhenvald A. Y. Imperatives and commands. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. 520 p.
24. Searle, J. R. A taxonomy of illocutionary acts // *Language, mind and knowledge* / ed. K. Gunderson. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1975. P. 344–369. (Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science. Vol. 7).
25. Alston W. P. Illocutionary acts and sentence meaning. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000. 352 p.
26. Kamp H. Free choice permission // *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. 1974. Vol. 74. Iss. 1. P. 57–74. DOI: 10.1093/aristotelian/74.1.57.
27. Searle J. R. How to derive “ought” from “is” // *Philosophical Review*. 1964. Vol. 73. No. 1. P. 43–58. DOI: 10.2307/2183201.
28. Sadock J., Zwicky A. Speech act distinctions in syntax. In: *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* / ed. T. Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. P. 155–196.
29. Chierchia G., McConnell-Ginet S. *Meaning and Grammar: An Introduction to Semantics*; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000. 573 p.
30. Reis M. On sentence types in German: An enquiry into the relationship between grammar and pragmatics // *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis*. 1999. Vol. 4. No. 2. P. 195–236.
31. Baker C. L. Notes of the description of English questions // *Foundations of Language*, 1970. Vol. 6. No. 2. P. 197–219.
32. Cheng L. On the Typology of wh-questions: PhD Dissertation. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, 1991. 237 p.
33. Han C. H. The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in Universal Grammar: PhD Dissertation in Linguistics. Philadelphia, 1998. 237 p.
34. Rivero M. L., Terzi A. Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood // *Journal of Linguistics*. 1995. Vol. 31. Iss. 2. P. 301–322. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226700015620.
35. Rizzi L. Speculations on verb-second // *Grammar in Progress* / J. Mascaró, M. Nespór (eds.). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1990. P. 137–152.
36. Zanuttini R., Pak M., Portner P. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects // *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. 2012. Vol. 30. P. 1231–1274. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-012-9176-2.
37. Формановская Н. И. Речевое взаимодействие. Коммуникация и прагматика. М.: ИКАР, 2007. 478 с.

38. Austin J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. 168 p.
39. Condoravdi C., Lauer S. Imperatives: meaning and illocutionary force // *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 9 / ed. Ch. Piñón. Paris: Universite Paris, 2012. P. 37–58.
40. Bach K., Harnish R. M. *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1979. 327 p.
41. Downes W. The imperative and pragmatics // *Journal of Linguistics*. 1977. Vol. 13. No. 1. P. 77–97.
42. Chomsky N. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1986. 102 p.
43. Koopman H. *The syntax of verbs: from verb-movement rules in the Kru Languages to universal grammar: Doctoral Thesis*. Dordrecht, 1984. 242 p.
44. Koster J. Dutch as an SOV language // *Linguistic Analysis*. 1975. Vol. 1. Iss. 2. P. 111–136.
45. Flagg E. “You” can’t say that: restrictions on overt subjects in the English imperative // *CLS 37: The main session. Papers from the 37th meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Vol. 1 / ed. M. Andronis, Ch. Ball, H. Elston, S. Neuvel. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 2001. P. 161–174.
46. Pollock J.-Y. Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP // *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1989. Vol. 20. No. 3. P. 365–424.
47. Pollock J.-Y. Notes on clause structure // *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax* / ed. L. Haegeman. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1997. P. 237–279.
48. Осипчук А. Е. Грамматические средства выражения семантики императивности в речевом жанре «приказание» // *Научный диалог*. 2020. № 1. С. 141–157. DOI: 10.24224/2227-1295-2020-1-141-157.
49. Kaufmann M. *Interpreting imperatives*. New York: Springer, 2012. 272 p. (Series: Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Vol. 88). DOI: 10.1007/978-94-007-2269-9.
50. Schmerling S. How imperatives are special and how they aren’t // *Papers from the Parasession on Nondeclaratives: Chicago Linguistic Society* / ed. S. Robinson, T. Kevin, C. Robert. Chicago: Chicago Press, 1982. P. 202–218.
51. Эслами З. Р., Ларина Т. В., Пашмфоруш Р. Identity, politeness and discursive practices in a changing world (Идентичность, вежливость и дискурсивные практики в меняющемся мире) // *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. 2023. Т. 27. № 1. С. 7–38. DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-34051.

#### INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

*Supian* (Bandung, Indonesia) – Ph.D in Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Science; Lecturer, Russian Language and Literature Study Program, Padjadjaran University;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2774-0685>; e-mail: [supian@unpad.ac.id](mailto:supian@unpad.ac.id)

*Ladinata* (Bandung, Indonesia) – M.A. in Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Science; Lecturer, Russian Language and Literature Study Program, Padjadjaran University;  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8775-5109>; e-mail: [ladinata@unpad.ac.id](mailto:ladinata@unpad.ac.id)

*Ruswan Dallyono* (Bandung, Indonesia) – Doctor in Linguistics, Department of English Literature, Faculty of Language and Literature Education; Lecturer, English Language and Literature Study Program, Indonesia University of Education;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5345-1230>; e-mail: [ruswan.dallyono@upi.edu](mailto:ruswan.dallyono@upi.edu)

*Renaldy Serby Yudistira* (Bandung, Indonesia) – Bachelor Degree Holder, Department of English Literature, Faculty of Language and Literature Education; Student, English Language and Literature Study Program, Indonesia University of Education;  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0658-1165>; e-mail: [yudistirarenaldyserby@upi.edu](mailto:yudistirarenaldyserby@upi.edu)

#### ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

*Супиан* (г. Бандунг, Индонезия) – кандидат филологических наук, преподаватель по русскому языку и литературе факультета гуманитарных наук Университета Паджаджаран;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2774-0685>; e-mail: [supian@unpad.ac.id](mailto:supian@unpad.ac.id)

*Ладината* (г. Бандунг, Индонезия) – магистр, преподаватель по русскому языку и литературе факультета гуманитарных наук Университета Паджаджаран;  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8775-5109>; e-mail: [ladinata@unpad.ac.id](mailto:ladinata@unpad.ac.id)

*Даллионо Русван* (г. Бандунг, Индонезия) – доктор лингвистики кафедры английской литературы факультета образования в области языка и литературы, преподаватель программы по английскому языку и литературе Университета педагогического образования Индонезии;  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5345-1230>; e-mail: [ruswan.dallyono@upi.edu](mailto:ruswan.dallyono@upi.edu)

*Юдистира Ренальди Серби* (г. Бандунг, Индонезия) – бакалавр кафедры английской литературы факультета образования в области языка и литературы, студент программы по английскому языку и литературе Университета педагогического образования Индонезии;  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0658-1165>; e-mail: [yudistirarenaldyserby@upi.edu](mailto:yudistirarenaldyserby@upi.edu)