



Jurnal Sastra Indonesia

<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/jsi>



Directive and Assertive Speech in Najwa Shihab's Interrogative Rhetoric: A Study by The Podcast "Mata Najwa"

Rifatul Hasanah¹ & Ali Manshur²

^{1,2}Universitas KH. Mukhtar Syafaat

Article Info

Article History

Submitted February 1, 2026

Accepted April 19, 2026

Publish April 30, 2026

Keyword

speech, directive, assertive, interrogative rhetoric, critical discourse analysis, Mata Najwa podcast

Abstract

This study examines the use of directive and assertive speech in Najwa Shihab's interrogative rhetoric on the Mata Najwa podcast, employing the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach. This research departs from the view that journalistic questions are not neutral but function as a discursive strategy laden with power relations and ideologies. The method used is a descriptive qualitative method with a pragmatic theoretical framework (Searle's speech act) and Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA model, including text analysis, discursive practices, and social practices. The research data consists of Najwa Shihab's speech, which contains directive and assertive statements in the form of interrogative rhetoric, transcribed from Mata Najwa's podcast episodes. Data collection is conducted through listening, recording, and document study, while data analysis proceeds through the stages of identification, classification, pragmatic interpretation, and critical discourse analysis. The results of the study identified three main patterns of the use of speech in Najwa Shihab's interrogative rhetoric, namely: (1) indirect directive speech to direct the interpretation of the source, (2) explicit directive speech to control the focus and flow of argumentation, and (3) assertive speech in the form of interrogative to implicit insert ideological claims and assumptions. These three patterns systematically frame the speakers within the logic of public accountability, while simultaneously strengthening the media as a hegemonic actor in the production and control of discourse. From the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis, the practice reproduces the ideology of state criticism, the supremacy of public rationality, and the demands of institutional responsibility. The novelty of this research lies in integrating directive and assertive speech analysis into the format of interrogative rhetoric in broadcast media, demonstrating that journalistic questions are not neutral but function as a discursive strategy to frame meaning, direct interpretation, and shape public awareness. Thus, the interrogative rhetoric in the Mata Najwa podcast is understood as a language practice that actively reproduces power relations and ideologies in the digital public space.

*E-mail:

¹hasanahrifatul68@gmail.com

²alimanshur376@gmail.com

©2026 The Authors. Published by UNNES. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

DOI 10.15294/jsi.v15i1.42799

P ISSN: 2252-6315 E-ISSN: 2685-9599

INTRODUCTION

In today's democratic landscape, media conversations are essential to shaping what people think, especially when questioning those in power (Sakina & Hendrik, 2025). One of the prominent journalists in this field is Najwa Shihab, with her Podcast Mata Najwa (ARIFIN, 2021). His questioning style is known to be sharp, critical, and persuasive. This privilege lies not only in the content of the question, but also in the language strategy used, especially through two main categories of speech acts, namely: (1) directive speech acts, which function to suppress and direct the answers of the speakers, and (2) assertive speech acts, which are used to affirm a position or establish certain claims (Putri et al., 2025). In this context, language is no longer just a means of communication, but a tool of power that has three main functions, namely: (1) building consent, (2) undermining legitimacy, and (3) creating opposition in society (Suhardi & Salamah, 2025). In digital public spaces such as podcasts, this kind of language has a wide reach and a significant impact on public awareness. Recent studies show that question-based dialogue in the media shapes public opinion, emotional attitudes, and perceptions of socio-political issues. Therefore, analyzing speech actions in Najwa Shihab's questions is important for understanding how media language operates within power relations and discourse construction. Thus, this study emphasizes that the practice of language in the media has three main contributions, namely: (1) shaping public issues, (2) directing people's perspectives, and (3) influencing the dynamics of social discourse (K. D. Rahmawati et al., 2022).

Several previous studies have examined speech acts and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in various media contexts, such as news, political debates, and television talk shows (Yusuf, 2022). These findings can generally be classified into two main patterns, namely: (1) assertive speech actions used to build truthful claims, and (2) directive speech actions that function to control the interlocutor's response (Wibowo, 2022). In media studies, Fairclough (2020) emphasized that journalistic language is laden with ideology and power relations. However, previous research tends to have three main limitations, namely: (1) focusing on conventional media such as television and newspapers, (2) viewing the interviewer as a neutral party, and (3) not yet examining in depth strategic interactions in the format of digital dialogue (Mustawa Nur, 2022). Furthermore, research that specifically examines the pattern of questions in podcasts with the CDA approach and

integrates directive and assertive speech actions is still very limited (Fadhilah et al., 2025).

In fact, podcasts, as a new medium, offer a higher level of interactivity than television and news texts. However, previous research still focused on these conventional media and has not examined the specifics of linguistic practices in podcasts. Recent studies on digital audio media have also not discussed in depth pragmatic aspects, especially speech actions in dialogical interactions. Thus, there is a research gap: the absence of a comprehensive study of speech acts in podcasts, which underscores the urgency of this research.

Given the community's urgent needs and the lack of a literature review, this research examines in depth the use of directive and assertive speech in Najwa Shihab's interrogative rhetoric on the Mata Najwa podcast. The main purpose of this research is to reveal how language tactics are used to build a position of authority, put pressure on informants, and form a certain point of view on public issues. Speech is categorized as directive if it contains the intention to direct or request a specific response from the source, such as a request for clarification or an urge to answer. Meanwhile, assertive speech is characterized by statements that express the speaker's beliefs or claims. Interrogative rhetoric is recognized through the form of questions that do not merely ask for answers, but are used to suppress or lead opinions. Then, the main problem of this research is formulated into several questions: (1) What is the form and variety of directive and assertive speeches used by Najwa Shihab in the style of asking on the Mata Najwa podcast? (2) What is the use of this speech in building the relationship between power and ideology in discourse? This study also seeks to explain that speech is not value-free, but contains strategies and ideologies (Maghfiroh et al., 2023). In line with the perspective of modern Critical Discourse Analysis (van Leeuwen, 2021; Machin & Mayr, 2022), Language is defined as a social activity. Therefore, this research not only explains the form of linguistics, but also interprets the social meaning contained in it (C. D. Rahmawati et al., 2024).

This research begins with the claim that Najwa Shihab's questioning technique systematically employs directive and assertive speech as a conversational tactic to guide the discussion and challenge the main points of the speakers. It is hypothesized that assertive speech is used to highlight the information, facts, or ideas that form the basis of the question. In contrast, directive speech is used to encourage detail, responsibility, or acknowledgment (Kholifah & Mardiah, 2024). This method is considered to

create inequality between the interviewer and the interviewee, even though it is presented as an equal discussion. Recent studies in critical discourse analysis show that journalistic questions often serve to hold those in power accountable (Febriyola & Suprihatin, 2024). Therefore, this study examines the idea that Najwa Shihab's use of language is not only about conveying information, but also about influencing actions and expressing beliefs. Findings: This study should improve our understanding of the role of journalists as active participants in shaping social perceptions through language (Damarrosydi, 2025). In conclusion, the study offers valuable insights into pragmatics, critical discourse analysis, and digital media studies, both theoretically and practically.

METHOD

This study applies a descriptive qualitative method based on the study of Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis (Wahyuningtyas, 2025). A descriptive qualitative approach is used because this study focuses on a detailed description of the form, function, and meaning of directive and assertive speech actions that appear in Najwa Shihab's interrogative rhetoric (SITOMPUL, 2021). In addition, Critical Discourse Analysis is used to examine the practice of discourse, power relations, and ideologies reflected in these speeches. The CDA framework used refers to Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model, which includes the dimensions of text, discourse practice, and social practice (Utami, 2025).

The source of this research data comes from one of the episodes of the Mata Najwa podcast hosted by Najwa Shihab with the theme (Tom Lembong talks about Abolition, Prabowo & Jokowi: maybe my supporters are upset to hear this), which was aired on August 13, 2025. The data analyzed was Najwa Shihab's speech, which used directive, assertive language through interrogative rhetoric. These speeches were chosen because they reflect Najwa Shihab's typical communication strategy in digging for information, directing interlocutors, and fostering a critical attitude towards social, political, and public policy issues discussed in the Mata Najwa podcast.

Data collection was carried out using listening, recording, and document study techniques (Adillah et al., 2022). The viewing technique involves paying close attention to the selected episodes of the Mata Najwa podcast. Furthermore, the recording technique was used to capture Najwa Shihab's speech relevant to the research's focus, especially interrogative speech that contained directive and assertive speech acts. Meanwhile, the document study technique involves

transcribing speech from audiovisual podcasts into written texts, thereby facilitating data analysis.

Data analysis is carried out systematically and in stages (Jailani & Husnullail, 2024). The first stage includes transcription, which converts all of Najwa Shihab's speech into written text. The second stage is the identification of interrogative speech, which is choosing question-shaped speech used in the context of rhetoric. The third stage is the classification of speech acts, in which speech is grouped into directive and assertive speech acts according to Searle's speech act theory. The fourth stage is the interpretation of pragmatic functions, which involves analyzing the purpose and meaning of speech in the context of communication. The last stage is a critical discourse analysis using Fairclough's framework to examine the power relations, ideologies, and social contexts that underlie the use of speech in Mata Najwa's discourse.

The validity of the data in this study is guaranteed through theoretical triangulation, namely by combining pragmatic theory and Critical Discourse Analysis (Fajri, 2024). Speech theory is used to ensure the accuracy of data classification, while CDA (Fairclough) is used to strengthen the interpretation of the meaning and social context of discourse. With the triangulation of the theory, the results of the analysis are expected to have adequate validity and credibility (Marzuki, 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Brief Theoretical Framework (Fairclough)

From the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis developed by Fairclough, discourse is understood as a form of social practice that works through three interrelated dimensions of analysis (Mudiawati et al., 2023). The textual (micro) dimension emphasizes linguistic aspects, such as sentence construction, types of speech acts, lexicon choices, and the use of interrogative modalities and structures. The dimension of discursive practice (meso) examines the processes of producing and consuming texts, including how questions function in interactions to direct the topic, build legitimacy, or otherwise undermine the position of certain actors. Meanwhile, the dimension of social practice (macro) links discourse to power structures, dominant ideologies, and hegemonic mechanisms that operate in broader social and political contexts (Sofyaningrum & Setiawan, 2024).

Within this framework, Najwa Shihab is positioned as a media figure with significant symbolic capital. Therefore, the questions he asks in political interviews cannot be understood as neutral communication practices, but rather as discursive strategies that play a role in shaping

meaning, constructing power relations, and reproducing certain ideologies in the public sphere (Latifah et al., 2026).

FORM OF DIRECTIVE SPEECH

Directive speech is a statement or speech that aims to get others to do something. In other words, the speaker tries to influence the listener to act according to the speaker's wishes (Manshur & Setiadi, 2024).

1)

Speech data: "How would you *interpret* the difference in direction between the court's decision and the president's decision regarding your case?"

Type of speech act: Indirect directive (evaluative interrogative)

Linguistic form: Open-ended question sentences with cognitive verbs *interpreting*

Speaker position: Interviewer (dominant media actor)

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (subject of questionable state power)

2)

Speech data: I remember when you came out of the rutan, Mr. Tom, you mentioned that you were aware of many of the questions and anxieties that accompanied this abolition. *What* exactly is the anxiety you capture?

Types of speech acts: Directed speech acts (asking/asking for explanations)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentence (marked with a *what* question and a question mark)

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner (has a role of asking questions to dig up information)

Position of speaking partner: Resource person/interviewee (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to provide an explanation or clarification

3)

Speech data: Mr. Tom. Earlier, you said you understand that there are people who want you to continue moving forward through the judicial route. *ee* but then you *ee* accept this abolition. *What are the key considerations?*

Types of speech acts: Directed speech acts (asking/asking for explanations)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentence (open-ended question, marked by the phrase *ask what main consideration*)

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner (the party who explores the reasons and considerations of the source)

Position of speaking partner: Resource person/interviewee (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to explain his reasons or considerations

4) Statement data: *You also mentioned earlier about the reason for the palace. What is clear is the statement issued by the Minister of Health, Hadi Prasetyo. Ee mentioned that the reason for your abolition is not to legalize corruption. Eh, but because your case is more politically nuanced, it is also mentioned that the President wants to reduce political noise and encourage unity so that the energy of this nation does not run out on less productive things. I would also like to quote the Deputy Minister of Education, Juri Ardian Toro, who said that this decision to abolish was taken to knit the national rope and strengthen cooperation, especially to coincide with the 80th anniversary of the Republic of Indonesia's independence. I want to ask: when you are called or symbolized, what tool of reconciliation, what tool of unity, is associated with this abolition? How do you interpret it, Mr. Tom?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech act (asking/asking for feedback and assessment)

Linguistic form: Complex interrogative sentences (open-ended questions preceded by background presentations and excerpts of other parties' statements)

Speaker position: The interviewer/moderator of the discussion has the authority to direct the topic and solicit the speaker's personal reflection

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to provide interpretation, attitude, and personal meaning for his or her symbolization in the political context

5)

Speech data: Mr. Tom, with a reconciliation narrative like this, do you feel you owe a political debt to President Prabowo?

Type of speech: Directive speech (asking for an attitude or acknowledgment)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentences (direct questions with markers *if*)

Speaker's position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of testing the attitude and political position of the interviewee

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to provide an assessment or personal acknowledgment of the political relationship in question

6)

Data saying: Mr. Tom, this abolition will be given at the same time as the amnesty given to Haso Kristianto, the Secretary General of PDI Perjuangan, and in his case, some judges believe that the amnesty for Haso Kristianto is a political threat. How do you see that analysis? This is *a political thread off*. Meanwhile, by abolishing it, you mean

there are no conditions or burden, because the case is different between you and Haso. That is what you want to say.

Type of speech act: Directed speech act (asking/asking for assessment and clarification)

Linguistic form: Complex interrogative sentences (open-ended questions accompanied by explanations, assumptions, and paraphrasing statements)

Speaker's position: Interviewer/questioner, functions to confront the interviewee with public analysis and ask for clarification of attitudes

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to provide an assessment, affirmation, or rebuttal to the analysis

7)

Speech data: *So, you are no longer interested in finding out who the mastermind of your criminalization is, Mr. Tom?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech act (asking/asking for confirmation)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentences (confirmation questions with question intonation markers and question marks)

Speaker's position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of concluding the previous statement and then asking for confirmation from the source

The position of the speaking partner: The resource person (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to confirm or deny the conclusion

8)

Speech data: What is clear, Mr. Tom, is that your legal process began in the Jokowi administration and ended with abolition in the Prabowo era. *What is your interpretation of the relationship between the two governments?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech act (asking/asking for interpretation and assessment)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentence (open-ended question with *what* word)

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner, function directing the resource person to provide political interpretation of cross-government events

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to convey personal interpretation, views, or analysis

9)

Speech data: including one of the decision approaches taken by President Prabowo to stop your case. *Do you think that is an attempt by the Prabowo administration to draw a firm line between the old and current regimes?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech (asking/asking for assessment or interpretation)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentences (open-ended questions, marked with words *you think* and question marks)

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner, role of asking reflective questions to get the analysis of the source

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), i.e., the party who is asked to provide interpretation or response to President Prabowo's policies

10)

Data saying: *So the effort to correct justice from the old regime, or is this just a shift in power from the old regime, and which new regime?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech act (asking/asking for clarification or assessment)

Linguistic form: Optional/alternative interrogative sentences (open-ended questions that offer two options: correction of justice or shift of power)

Speaker's position: The interviewer/questioner plays a role in exploring the opinion or interpretation of the source on the political situation

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to give an assessment or choose between the two interpretations proposed

11)

Speech data: In your context, whom have you forgiven, Mr. Tom?

Type of speech: Directive speech (asking/asking for clarification or personal information)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentence (marked with a *question mark and* a question mark)

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner, role of asking for confession or personal information from the interviewee

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to mention or explain who has been forgiven

12)

Speech data: If I ask, 'Who works?' **Will** you feel that it is a question specific to one person and that you no longer want to, or how? *Because I remember in Playedo, you, for example, in the specifics of Playedo, you said that I joined the opposition, then I was criminally threatened. The signal from the ruler is very clear. Yes. What do you mean by " ruler in this context, in that context, when it was the ruler at that time, in this case, President Jokowi, or sustainability, or how? Alternatively, because you wanted to say that you wanted to close the book, you no longer*

want to discuss who the ruler you think was targeting you at that time.

Types of speech acts: Directive speech acts (asking/asking for clarification, explanation, and confirmation)

Linguistic form: Complex and layered interrogative sentences (containing several open-ended questions, who, *what*, *how*, and clarification of assumptions)

Speaker position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of digging up detailed information, clarifying the context, and the position of the resource person to the parties involved

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to provide an explanation, confirmation, or response to the speaker's allegations and interpretations

13)

Speech data: *How* would you describe your relationship with the seventh President Joko Widodo, Mr. Tom?

Type of speech act: Directive speech act (asking/asking for an assessment or description)

Linguistic form: Open-ended interrogative sentences (marked with the question word)

Speaker position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of asking the interviewee to explain the relationship or personal views

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to provide an assessment or description of the relationship with the President

14)

Speech data: When was the last personal communication, Mr. Tom?

Types of speech acts: Directive speech acts (asking/asking for time information)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentence (marked with a question mark)

Speaker's position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of asking for concrete information related to the last time of communication

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to provide information about the last communication time

15)

Speech data: *And you said earlier that you regretted that there was a perception that you did not appreciate the trust given by Mr. Jokowi when you were asked to be his advisor or to be a minister. Do you think that the perception that was formed later was what made this relationship, your relationship with Mr. Jokowi, considered to be a backward vis,*

even then a narrative, or the speculation that circulated that this criminalization was carried out by the ruler who was then the presidential notabo, who was indeed President Jokowi.

Types of speech acts: Directive speech acts (asking/asking for opinions, clarifications, and assessments)

Linguistic form: Complex interrogative sentences (long-winded open-ended questions, containing questions and asking for interpretation by the source)

Speaker's position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of asking for explanation, clarification, and reflection of the resource person on public perception and political relations

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who was asked to provide assessment, clarification, and reflection on the relationship between President Jokowi and public speculation

16)

Speech data: So, you really feel that President Prabowo's move will polarize this step. *Do you believe that?*

Type of speech: Directive speech (asking/asking for confirmation or affirmation)

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentences (open-ended questions that ask for confirmation, marked with the question *you believe it?* Düssel)

Speaker's position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of asking for the assessment and belief of the resource person on the effect of the President's policy

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to affirm or confirm his views and beliefs regarding the impact of the policy

17)

Speech data: *Some of your supporters may want to keep ee hit chromo so. Ee is still what is called taking the distance ee, separating between what you are going through, what you are fighting for, the political steps taken, and the benefits you. How do you answer those voices of your supporters, sir?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech act (asking/asking for a response or answer)

Language form: Open-ended interrogative sentences (questions asking the interviewee to respond to a third party's opinion or voice)

Speaker position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of asking for clarification, and the speaker's response to supporters or public opinion

Position of the speaking partner: The resource person (Mr. Tom), the party asked to respond,

provides an explanation or clarification of the supporter's perception.

18)

Speech data: *What, for example, do you think your supporters would rate you, Tom? No longer the Tom he used to be*

Type of speech: Directive speech (asking/asking for an assessment or opinion)

Linguistic form: Open-ended interrogative sentences (marked with *the question* word and asking for clarification of the source's assessment)

Speaker's position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of exploring the opinion or views of the resource person regarding the perception of the supporter

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to explain or interpret how the supporter assesses himself or herself

19)

Spokesperson: *Abolition deleted the case. 10 other suspects remain involved in this case. What do you think the process should be like for these other 10 suspects? What if you get their abolition, Mr. Tom?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech act (asking/asking for opinions and assessments)

Linguistic form: Complex interrogative sentences (open-ended questions with questions *about* how to ask for explanations and opinions of the source)

Speaker position: The interviewer/questioner plays the role of asking for the speaker's views on the handling of other suspects and the effects of abolition

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who is asked to respond, provide explanations, or assess the procedures that should be carried out against other suspects

21)

Speech data: *Is there any plan you have to advocate for this specifically, for example, to the 3rd Committee of the House of Representatives or other measures? ... So specifically, are there any steps you would take to advocate for this?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech (interrogative). This speech aims to elicit a response or action from the speech partner, namely, an explanation of the concrete advocacy plan the resource person will implement. Although it contains statements or affirmations about the speaker's attitude and experience, the main function of the speech is still to request clarification and encourage the speaker to answer.

Linguistic form: Complex interrogative sentences. Speech is structured as questions, characterized by the use of the question word "what" and

interrogative intonation, though it is accompanied by declarative sentences to explain or reinforce the context.

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner. The role of the speaker is to ask critical questions, summarize previous statements, and encourage the speaker to convey a more specific attitude and action plan.

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom). The speaking partner plays the role of the party asked to provide answers, clarifications, and affirmations of commitment related to the issues discussed.

24)

Data saying: *This is sharing your journal, Sir... Here is what you have, how many of these, sir? How many in total are there? ... So, 9 months are inside, how many holders are there?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech (interrogative). This speech aims to request information from the speech partner about the number of journals/notes written while in the detention center. Although accompanied by explanatory statements and paraphrasing, the main function of speech is still a question that expects an answer.

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentences with declarative inserts. Speech is dominated by question sentences, characterized by the use of the phrase "*how much*", while declarative sentences are used to introduce and explain the context.

Speaker's position: Interviewer/questioner. The role of the speaker is to uncover factual information and frame the speaker's experience while in custody.

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Sir) The speaking partner plays the role of a party who provides information and clarification about personal experience and the number of journals in question.

25)

Speech data: *You do not mind showing some records... Actually, what is written a lot?*

Type of speech act: Directive speech (interrogative). This speech aims to solicit responses and approvals from speech partners and to request information about the content of the written notes. The speaker directs the speaking partner to answer and, if willing, to show the notes. Linguistic form: Interrogative sentences. Speech is delivered in the form of questions, characterized by the use of the phrases "*there is no objection*" and "*what*", and by a polite, mitigating speaking style.

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner. The role of the speaker is to ask questions carefully,

maintaining politeness as they gather personal information.

Position of speaking partner: Resource person. The speaking partner plays the role of the party granting or denying permission, as well as explaining the content of the record in question.

26)

Data says: Is *there not* one thing in you, Mr. Tom, that feels like you will never return to the way you were after this experience of life?

Types of speech acts: Directive (interrogative) speech is intended to elicit answers and personal reflection from the speech partner about profound self-changes following certain life experiences. The speaker directs the speech partner to respond with personal views or feelings.

Linguistic form: Interrogative sentences. Speech is delivered in the form of questions, characterized by the structure *of the "no no" question, the use of question marks, and* interrogative intonation.

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner. The role of the speaker is to ask reflective questions, aiming to explore the psychological aspects and subjective experiences of the speaker.

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom). Speaking partners play the role of a party that provides reflective answers, expressing their experiences and perceived self-changes.

FORMS OF ASSERTIVE SPEECH

Assertive speech is speech or statements that state facts, information, or opinions of the speaker. This act of speech aims to communicate something that is considered true by the speaker (Utomo et al., 2023).

20)

However, the judge and the prosecutor's office have said the abolition is a matter of personal choice. *Only applies to you, not another.*

Type of speech: Assertive/declarative speech – this sentence conveys the facts or truth that the speaker believes, namely, the personal nature of the abolition that only applies to the speaker.

Linguistic form: Declarative sentences (stating facts/statements, not questions or commands)

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner, role in providing information or conveying facts from other parties (judges and prosecutors) to the resource person

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom), the party who receives the information and can respond or confirm

22)

Speech data: *But you see, there is another urgency at this time.*

Type of speech act: Assertive/declarative speech act. This speech functions to express the speaker's views or assessment of the speaker's view or assessment of the urgency felt by the speaker at this time. The speaker conveys information or assumptions considered correct as a basis for continuing the interview.

Linguistic form: Declarative sentences. Speech is delivered in the form of statements, not containing questions or commands.

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner. The role of the speaker is to convey an interpretation or a temporary summary of the speaker's attitude to maintain the flow and continuity of the interview.

Position of speaking partner: Resource person (Mr. Tom). The speaking partner plays the role of the party that receives the statement and has the opportunity to confirm, clarify, or respond to the view.

27)

Speech data: *So that understanding of consciousness is what you feel you really got during your lifetime.*

Type of speech act: Assertive/declarative speech act. This speech functions to express the summary or affirmation of the speaker's understanding of the inner experience experienced by the speech partner. The speaker conveys an interpretation considered correct as the basis for continuing the conversation.

Linguistic form: Declarative sentences. Speech is delivered in the form of statements, containing no elements of questions or commands, although the structure is not grammatically complete.

Speaker position: Interviewer/questioner. The role of the speaker is to summarize and implicitly confirm the speaking partner's previous statement to maintain the flow of the interview.

Position of speaking partner: Resource person. Speaking partners serve as parties who receive affirmation and have the opportunity to confirm or clarify the speaker's understanding.

Based on the overall analysis of the speech data, the interview discourse is dominated by directive speech, particularly in the form of interrogative questions. The interviewer consistently uses open-ended, confirmation, evaluative, and reflective questions to guide the conversation and elicit information, attitudes, assessments, and personal reflections from the interviewee (Mr. Tom).

Most of the acts of the directive not only function to ask for factual information, but also

direct the resource person to interpret, evaluate, and frame the meaning of the political and legal events they experience, such as the granting of abolition, relations between government regimes, the issue of criminalization, and the narrative of national reconciliation. This can be seen in the use of cognitive verbs such as interpret, see, describe, and assess, which show that questions are not neutral but contain interpretive impulses.

Linguistically, the interviewer's speech is generally delivered in the form of open and complex interrogatives. Many questions are preceded by background presentations, excerpts from state officials' statements, public assumptions, or a summary of previous speakers' statements. This strategy shows that the interviewer not only asks but also frames the discourse's context, ensuring the speaker's answers fall within a certain corridor. Thus, the directive function not only asks for answers but also directs the focus and depth of responses.

In terms of speaking position, the interviewer occupies a dominant media role, with discursive authority to determine the topic, regulate the flow of the conversation, and test the consistency and political attitudes of the speakers. Meanwhile, the speakers, despite being public figures and subjects of state power, are in a position as parties constantly asked to provide clarification, justification, assessment, and reflection on sensitive issues.

In addition to directive speech, interviewers use assertive speech to convey information, facts, or temporary summaries. This assertive speech maintains the continuity of discourse, affirms certain positions (for example, the personal nature of abolition), and provides a foothold for follow-up questions. By explicitly stating assumptions or interpretations, the interviewer implicitly invites the interviewee to confirm or correct them.

Overall, the combination of directive and assertive speech forms a subtle exploratory, evaluative, and confrontational pattern of interviews, especially in discussing power relations, political legitimacy, and the symbolic meaning of abolition in the context of regime change

USES OF SPEECH

Directive Speech (Interviewer's Questions)

The majority of the data you display is directive speech, which is a question that asks for a response, assessment, clarification, or confirmation from the resource person (Mr. Tom). The function of this speech in building power and ideology can be explained as follows:

Building power

1. **Dominant speaker position:** The interviewer occupies a position that has the authority to direct the discourse. For example, in data 1–19, the interviewer determines the topic, framing of the question, and the point of view they want to explore from the source.
2. **Narrative control:** By asking complex, alternative, or confrontational questions (e.g., data 6, 10), the interviewer puts themselves in a position to answer or justify a framed interpretation. This shows the power of discourse: whoever asks the question has the right to frame the political context.
3. **Disclosure of political positions:** Questions about abolition, relations with the president, and public perception (data 5, 8, 13, 15) put the interviewees in a position to reveal their political stances, so that the control of discourse as well as the symbolic control of power is clearly visible.

Spreading ideology

1. **Normalization of certain political narratives:** For example, in data 4, the question includes a quote about abolition as a tool of reconciliation and unity. This frames the political ideology of "national reconciliation" as a value that is expected to be accepted by the public.
2. **Framing public perception:** Questions that refer to supportive or public opinion (data 17, 18) emphasize that certain political ideologies (e.g., loyalty, polarization, leadership legitimacy) become the framework for the evaluation of the speakers.
3. **Encouraging internalization of ideology:** By asking personal views or reflections (data 26), the interviewees were directed to interpret their personal experiences through a certain lens that the interviewer had framed.

Assertive Speech (Interviewer's Statement)

Data 20, 22, and 27 are acts of assertive speech, namely statements that convey facts or interpretations.

Building power

1. **Affirming information or facts:** For example, "the judge and the prosecutor's office have said that abolition is personal" (data 20) confirms facts that limit the speaker's space of movement, while also showing the interviewer's control over the information conveyed.
2. **Reinforcing discourse authority:** By summarizing or affirming the interviewees' experiences (data 27), the interviewer demonstrates the capacity to interpret and

control the narrative flow of the interview.

Spreading ideology

- 1. Framing subjective experiences through specific interpretations:** For example, affirming that the speaker's experience can be understood as learning or awareness (data 27), shaping the audience's perception of the speaker according to a particular ideology (e.g., ideology of nationalism, reconciliation, or political legitimacy).
- 2. Establishing norms or views that are considered legitimate:** By assertively stating facts or interpretations, the interviewer helps to affirm the ideological framework that the public wants to accept, e.g., the ideology of "political reconciliation is more important than revenge" (seen in data 4, 16).

Synthesis: The Relationship of Power and Ideology in Discourse

- 1. The power of discourse:** The interviewer as the determinant of the direction of the question and the controller of information asserts the dominant position in the discourse. Resource persons, although influential figures, are placed in the position of answering, interpreting, and confirming.
- 2. Constructed ideology:** Through questions and statements that frame the speakers in a specific political context, this discourse disseminates and affirms the ideology of reconciliation, presidential legitimacy, and the value of adherence to applicable political norms.
- 3. Interaction between power and ideology:** The power of the interviewer (control over the flow of the interview, framing of questions) is used to propagate a particular ideology, so that the listener or audience is directed to accept a view that has been systematically framed.

ANALYTICAL CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of the interview discourse, it can be concluded that the interviewer's dominance in directive speech positions Mr. Tom in a limited, directive role. The interviewer uses open-ended, confirming, evaluative, and reflective questions to not only ask for factual information, but also encourage the interviewee to interpret, assess, and frame his or her political experiences and personal decisions in a specific context (Tahir et al., 2023). With this strategy, the speakers were directed to confirm previously constructed assumptions, justify political decisions, and affirm their positions and attitudes towards sensitive issues such as abolition,

inter-regime relations, reconciliation narratives, and public perception.

In addition, the interviewer's use of assertive speech, in the form of a statement of facts or a summary of the speaker's experience, strengthens the authority of the discourse and affirms a particular interpretive framework. For example, affirming the personal nature of abolition or summarizing Pak Tom's experience invites the interviewee to affirm or clarify his views within the framework established. This shows that the interviewer does not just ask questions but also frames meanings that function as instruments for spreading ideology.

Overall, the interaction between directive and assertive speech creates a subtle, exploratory, confrontational discourse. The interviewer controls the direction of the conversation, determines the issue's focus, and shapes the audience's desired interpretation. Speakers, although influential figures, are placed in positions to provide clarification, assessment, and reflection, so that these discourses reflect symbolic and narrative control that emphasize political legitimacy, national reconciliation, and norms of compliance with state authority.

Implicitly, the interviewee is forced to interpret personal experiences and political decisions through the lens that the interviewer has framed. At the same time, the audience is directed to accept a particular ideological framework as a legitimate norm or fact. Thus, interviews not only serve as a tool for information mining but also as a medium to build the power of discourse, control political narratives, and disseminate ideologies that support the regime's legitimacy and the prevailing political norms.

Based on the results of pragmatic analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis of Najwa Shihab's interrogative rhetoric in the Mata Najwa podcast, it can be concluded that the interview practice is not neutral but is loaded with linguistic strategies that reflect certain power relations and ideologies.

The dominance of directive speech, especially in the form of open, confirmative, evaluative, and reflective interrogative questions, indicates that the interviewer actively directs the flow of the discourse and frames the speaker's answers in a predetermined corridor of meaning. These questions not only serve as a tool for extracting factual information but also as an instrument for encouraging the speakers to interpret, evaluate, and legitimize the political and legal events under discussion.

CONCLUSION

Based on pragmatic analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis, this study shows that the dominance of directive and assertive speech in Mata Najwa's interviews places the interviewer as an actor with significant discourse control. Directive speech is used to direct, pressure, and demand clarification and evaluation from the speaker. In contrast, assertive speech builds an interpretive framework by presenting facts, assumptions, and summaries that guide the discourse. The interaction between the two results in an implicitly exploratory and confrontational interview pattern, thereby limiting the speaker's interpretive space and strengthening the interviewer's dominant position in the negotiation of meaning. From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, these findings confirm that language functions as an instrument for reproducing power relations and ideology, as well as a strategic mechanism for shaping public opinion in the digital media space.

REFERENCES

- Adillah, R. U., Muhtarom, I., & Sugiarti, D. H. (2022). Analisis kesantunan berbahasa dalam novel Menggapai Matahari karya Adnan Katino. *Bahtera Indonesia; Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 7(1), 272–288.
- ARIFIN, R. A. B. (2021). *Potret Kepemimpinan Perempuan Dalam Media Dan Ruang*. 32((3)), 167–186.
- Damarrosydi, A. A. (2025). Media Framing Dalam Pemberitaan Intimidasi Terhadap Jurnalis. *Jurnal Adijaya Multidisiplin*, 3(02), 241–248.
- Fadhilah, S. D., Botifar, M., & Hartati, M. (2025). *Analisis Pandangan Cyberpragmatik di Youtube pada Podcast Akun Sosial Media Deddy Corbuzier*. Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup.
- Fajri, A. (2024). *Analisis Wacana Kritis Atas Pemaknaan Lafaz Auliya' Dalam Perspektif Al-Qur 'An Dan Terjemahnya Edisi 2019 Kemenag RI*. Institut PTIQ Jakarta.
- Febriyola, D. F., & Suprihatin, S. (2024). Analisis Wacana Penerapan Kode Etik Jurnalistik dalam Peliputan di Film Korea "The Tunnel". *DIGICOM: Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Media*, 4(2), 186–194.
- Jailani, M. S., & Husnullail, M. (2024). Metode Grounded Theory dalam Pendekatan Praktis. *Jurnal Cahaya Mandalika ISSN 2721-4796 (Online)*, 5(1), 47–58.
- Kholifah, D., & Mardiah, Z. (2024). Tindak Tutur Dialog Politik dalam Video Podcast Haris Azhar dan Fatia Maulidyanti pada Media Sosial YouTube. *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 18(5), 3542–3556.
- Latifah, R. N., Mahirsah, M. K., Pranata, D. A. P., & Syukri, H. (2026). Representasi Kekuasaan dalam Teks Supersemar: Kajian Analisis Wacana Kritis Ruth Wodak. *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*, 4(4), 3041–3050.
- Maghfiroh, A., Karim, M., & Rahariyoso, D. (2023). Kredo Puisi dan Mitos, Sebuah Ideologi Sastra Lisan dalam Karya Sutardji Calzoum Bachri. *Kajian Linguistik Dan Sastra*, 2(3), 256–269.
- Manshur, A., & Setiadi, G. S. G. (2024). Tuturan Imperatif Dalam Ungkapan Di Bak Truk Pada Perjalanan Muncar-Blokagung Banyuwangi (KAJIAN SOSIOPRAGMATIK). *Jurnal PENEROKA*, 4(2), 223–236.
- Marzuki, I. (2023). Analisis Wacana Kritis (Teori dan Praktik). *Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong. UNIMUDAPress*.
- Mudiawati, R. C., Hudiyo, Y., & Suhatmady, B. (2023). Analisis wacana kritis Norman Fairclough terhadap bahasa slogan aksi demonstrasi guru di Samarinda. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 6(3), 739–762.
- Mustawa Nur, S. H. (2022). *Hukum pemberitaan pers: Sebuah model mencegah kesalahan dalam berita*. Prenada Media.
- Putri, D. N. A., Aurelia, S., Salsabila, S., & Sya'adah, H. (2025). Tindak Tutur Direktif Komentar Warganet dalam Postingan Najwa Shihab tentang Peringatan Darurat. *Journal of Talent and Innovation*, 1–15.
- Rahmawati, C. D., Busri, H., & Badrih, M. (2024). Makna denotasi dan konotasi meme dalam media sosial twitter: Kajian semiotika roland barthes. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 10(2), 1244–1256.
- Rahmawati, K. D., Yulianeta, Y., Hardini, T. I., Sunendar, D., & Fasya, M. (2022). Xenoglosifilia: Ancaman terhadap pergeseran bahasa Indonesia di era globalisasi. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 22(2), 168–181.
- Sakina, I., & Hendrik, D. (2025). Perkembangan media massa Indonesia: Analisis kekuatan politik dan pengaruhnya terhadap demokrasi The development of Indonesian mass media: An analysis of political power and its influence on democracy. *Jurnal Politik Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Politics)*, 11(1), 96–106.
- SITOMPUL, B. B. I. A. B. (2021). *Analisis Tindak Tutur Lokusi, Ilokusi Dan Perlokusi Dalam Catatan Najwa Shihab Di Platform Youtube Kajian Pragmatik*.
- Sofyaningrum, R., & Setiawan, A. (2024). Analisis Wacana Kritis Video Instagram Objek Wisata Kebumen Melalui Perspektif Fairclough. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 9(2), 122–133.
- Suhardi, S., & Salamah, S. (2025). Bahasa Sebagai Alat Hegemoni: Studi Literatur Tentang Wacana Media. *Journal Media Public Relations*, 5(1), 8–16.
- Tahir, R., Kalis, M. C. I., Thamrin, S., Rosnani, T., Suharman, H., Purnamasari, D., Priyono, D., Laka, L., Komariah, A., & Indahyani, T. (2023). *METODOLOGI PENELITIAN KUALITATIF: Mengumpulkan Bukti, Menyusun Analisis, Mengkomunikasikan Dampak*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Utami, E. A. (2025). Praktik Wacana Dalam Film Sang Kiai Menunjukkan Relasi Kekuasaan, Ideologi, dan Nilai Sosial-Budaya, Ditinjau Melalui Pendekatan Analisis Wacana Kritis Norman Fairclough. *JIMU: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisipliner*, 3(04), 522–531.
- Utomo, A. P. Y., Farkhatunnisa, A., & Fitriyani, A. (2023). Tindak Tutur Asertif dan Direktif pada Novel "Tak Putus Dirundung Malang" Karya S. Takdir

- Alisjahbana. *VOKAL: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(1), 19–30.
- Wahyuningtyas, A. F. (2025). Myth of Masculinity in Novels Seperti Dendam, Rindu Harus Dibayar Tuntas by Eka Kurniawan. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 14(3), 285–296.
- Wibowo, W. (2022). *Konsep Tindak Tutur Komunikasi*. Bumi Aksara.
- Yusuf, H. D. A. B. (2022). Lakon Komedi Televisi “Lapor Pak!” di Trans 7 (Kajian Wacana Kritis Model Teun A. Van Dijk). *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan*, 8(2).