



Speech Acts of Classroom Interaction



Ahmad Syaifudin Azhari ^a
Priono ^b
Nuriadi ^c

Article history:

Received: 10 August 2017

Revised: 25 February 2018

Approved: 28 February 2018

Published: 6 March 2018

Keywords:

Speech Acts;

Pragmatic Competence;

Communication Strategies;

Abstract

Speech acts of classroom interaction have been an interesting topic both in ESL and EFL context. Little research, however, has been held in analyzing speech acts of classroom interaction and its relation to strategies used in EFL context. This paper aims at investigating the types and frequency of speech acts performed in terms of teacher-student interactions. It also focuses on analyzing strategies used by teachers and students in performing the illocutionary act of imperatives. Qualitative method is used by means of mixed pragmatic-discourse approach. The data were collected through observation and recording. Three English teachers and 30 male students grade IX of MTs NW Putra Nurul Haramain are participants for gathering the data. The study reveals that four types of speech acts performed are imperatives, assertive, expressions, and commissives. Of those speech acts performed, the very dominant type of speech acts performed, about 120 acts or 43% is imperatives. Assertions about 117 acts or 42% are dominant acts. Expressions about 34 acts or 12% area less dominant category and Commissives about 7 or 2,5% are not dominant. In relation to strategies used in realization of imperatives, the study recognizes that requests as strategies used in realization of request are (a) formal completeness (propositional completeness and modification), (b) level of directness (mood derivable, performative, hedged performative, locution derivable, and conventionally indirect), (c) point of views, (d) context, and (e) mood. The study reveals that imperatives as the most type of illocutionary act performed in classroom interaction. Furthermore, it also indicates the lack of students' pragmatic competence in performing such an act. For that reason, teachers need to expose the learners with communication strategies in order to speak accurately and appropriately in different context. It needs a further study about pragmatic competence needed in EFL context and material designs for teaching such competences.

2455-8028© Copyright 2018. The Author.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

All rights reserved.

^a English Graduate Department, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University-Indonesia

^b English Graduate Department, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University-Indonesia

^c English Graduate Department, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University-Indonesia

Author correspondence:

Ahmad Syaifudin Azhari,

English Graduate Department, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University-Indonesia

Email address: ahmadsyaifudinazhari@yahoo.co.id

1. Introduction

English has become an international language. This leads many countries to learn English. In Indonesia, teaching English is treated as a foreign language since it is not used as a means of daily communication. It differs from teaching English as a second language in the sense that English is used as a means of communication. This distinct environment also triggers different focus on language teaching, method, techniques and so forth. That is to say, there are many concerns that are crucial to being investigated, especially about teaching English as a foreign language.

Actually, most of the schools or English language teaching programs emphasize learners in order to have linguistic competences in terms of phonology, grammar, morphology, semantics, and syntax. However, those are not enough for effective communication. In this case, especially for learning English as a second or a foreign language, communicative competence must be mastered in order to speak accurately and appropriately.

This study is focused on analyzing the types of speech acts perform in classroom interaction involving teachers-students interaction. Communication strategies are also looked at to describe the speakers' verbal plans in achieving purposes of communication. This study also attempts to recognize students' ability in performing an illocutionary act of imperatives. The rationale for choosing speech acts as the main concern is that speech acts are one of the core elements of communication including linguistic and pragmatic competence of language users. Thus, in relation to a second or a foreign language acquisition, the students can be taught how to communicate appropriately by a means of speech units that are speech acts. Furthermore, most of the students might know how to communicate accurately but inappropriately when they talk with native speakers. Such an inappropriate communication is due to students' lack of communicative competence including pragmatic competence (speech act). For that reason, to avoid such mistakes the teachers need to teach pragmatic competence by introducing the rule of speaking of any kind of speech acts. Hence, it is important to analyze the speech acts in a classroom setting. To gain information about such concerns, teachers and 30 students of grade IX of MTS NW Putra Nurul Haramain, is the sample of this study. That school is chosen because the school has emphasized the use of English as daily communication in the school. Furthermore, it is also accessible and possible for conducting the study in that school in relation to the purposes of the study.

MTS NW Putra Nurul Haramain is one of the Islamic boarding schools located in Narmada West Nusa Tenggara province. It is a well-known school due to the students' achievement. In this school, the students are obliged to speak English or Arabic as a means of communication in their daily activities. The students come from Indonesia, like Java, Sulawesi, Sumatera and so forth.

Austin's account of speech act has turn linguists concern about an epistemic aspect of speech act theory. [Austin's remark \(1962\)](#) 'in saying something, [we] do something' has pointed out that speech acts consist of locutionary act, illocutionary act, perlocutionary acts. Most of the scholars pay attention to illocutionary acts generating two lines of speech act theory: (a) on the basis of conventional or illocutionary rule like [Austin \(1962\)](#), [Sbisa \(2001\)](#), [Searle \(1969\)](#), [Strawson \(1971\)](#) and [Vanderveken \(1991\)](#); and (b) on the basis of inference like [Grice \(1957\)](#), [Bach and Harnish \(1981\)](#), and [Kissine \(2013\)](#). As a result, it is not surprising if the types of illocutionary acts proposed to vary according to the perspectives believed. Apart from the dispute, the most common and comprehensive principles used for categorizing the types of speech act is [Searle's \(1979\)](#) taxonomy of speech acts.

In relation to language acquisition, speech acts have been one of the communicative competencies that are crucial to being taught ([Murcia, Dornyei, & Thurrel, 1995](#)). That Some empirical studies have been done focused on the importance of students' acquisition of speech acts are (a) [Wolfson \(1983\)](#) about analysis of complimenting in American English, (b) [Blum-Kulka and House \(1989\)](#) about Cross-cultural pragmatics: Request and apologies, (c) [House and Kasper \(1987\)](#) about Interlanguage pragmatics: requesting in a foreign language, (d) [Ellis \(1992\)](#) about a study of two language learners' request, and many others. However, the studies only focus on the students' acquisition of a particular speech act and are held in ESL context.

Based on those previous studies, there is a little study conducted in English as Foreign Language context. Thus it needs conducting this study in order to give a description about types of speech acts in classroom interaction. Finding out the types of speech acts in classroom interaction is crucial since each type has different

features and strategies used to perform it. This might provide bases for a teacher in teaching pragmatic competence by means of providing comprehensive input about core features and strategies of each type of speech act.

Furthermore, in performing speech acts, speakers commonly use communication strategies for achieving their own purposes. This is one of the aspects of communicative competence that is relevant to be studied. In this study, the strategies used in performing requests in teachers-students interaction are also studied.

The aims of this paper are (a) What types of speech acts are performed in classroom interaction between Teacher-students? and (b) How imperatives are realized in teacher and students interaction?

Theoretical framework

Speech acts are related to speakers' performance in saying something. Austin's seminal work (1962) in his book "*How to do something with words*" has a far-reaching contribution to the theory of speech acts. Austin's speech act theory is grounded on his earlier notion about performative and constative distinctions. This led him to claim that such constative and performative distinctions stand to the dimension of language uses in terms of locutionary and illocutionary acts as the basis for the general theory within the total of speech acts.

He distinguishes that three dimensions of the use of a sentence or language are (a) locutionary acts, (b) illocutionary acts, and (c) perlocutionary acts. The first dimension is related to produce a sentence with a particular sense and reference. The next part refers to a sentence with a conventional force such as informing, ordering and so on. The last dimension is dealt with the effect of saying something like convincing the hearers. For Austin, illocutionary acts can be differentiated from perlocutionary acts in the senses of securing uptake, taking effect and inviting a response. He also asserted that illocutionary acts are very much subject to the conventional force, while the perlocutionary effect is otherwise.

According to Austin (1969), there are five types of speech acts or illocutionary acts based on the illocutionary force:

- a) Verdictive, related to the use of judgment for giving a verdict;
- b) Executives, dealing with using power or asserting influence such as appointing, voting, arguing, advising and warning;
- c) Commissive, having the commitment to do something in the future including declared intention;
- d) Behabitives, about expressing attitude;
- e) And expositive pertain to clarification of reason, argument, and communication.

The lists of verbs under those five categories are as follow:

- a) Verdictives: acquit, convict, find, hold, interpret, understand, rule, calculate, reckon, estimate, locate, place, date, measure, grade, rank, rate, assess, value, describe, characterize, diagnose, and analyze;
 - b) Exercitives: order, command, direct, sentence, fine, grant, vote for, choose, claim, nominate, bequeath, pardon, give, warn, advise, resign, urge, announce, entreat, annual and the rest;
 - c) Commissive: promise, covenant, contract, undertake, give my word, intend, mean to, plan, purpose, declare my intention, am determined to, bind my self, vow, swear, espouse, oppose and so on;
 - d) Behabitives: apologies, thank, commiserate, compliment, condole, criticize, comment, welcome, bless, wish, dare, defy, challenge;
 - e) Expositives: affirm, deny, state, describe, identify, remark, mention, inform, appraise, tell, ask, testify, accept, concede, correct, revise, deduce, turn to, interpret, distinguish, and so forth.
- (summarised from Austin, 1962, 152-162).

Austin's speech act classification has a significant influence on the development of speech act theory. However, his categories seem to have a number of weaknesses. Searle (1979) argues that there are some weaknesses of Austin categories of speech acts: (a) not all verbs listed are illocutionary verbs, (b) there is no consistent principle as the ground for taxonomy, (c) there are overlap distributions among the categories, and (d) there are also overlaps within the same category.

Based on Austin's weakness classification, Searle offers an alternative classification of illocutionary acts grounded on three main criteria: (a) illocutionary point, (b) direction of fit, and (d) sincerity condition expressed. As Searle (1979) argue there are five kinds of illocutionary acts:

- a) **Assertiveness**
The point of assertive is to commit the speaker to the truth of what he says. Its direction of fit is words to worlds or downgrade direction (↓). The psychological state expressed is belief. For Searle, assertive can be assessed in terms of true-false since it contains speakers' belief in performing that type. This type includes statements, boasts, complain, conclude and deduce. He also asserts that assertive type can be tested through a literal character in the sense of true-false dimension. Some of Austin classification of expositive and verdictives are assertive.
- b) **Directives**
The illocutionary point of the directive is speakers' attempt to get hearer to perform something. Its direction of fit is the world to words or upgrade direction (↑). In this respect, what the hearer perform is based on the speaker's want or desire. The sincerity condition expressed by the speaker wants or desire. For Searle, some verbs that can be used for performing directives are asked, order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat and the rest. In this case, what Austin categorizes as exercitives like the question is also directive. Likewise, Austin category of behabitive such as defy, dare, the challenge is part of the directive.
- c) **Commissives**
The point or purposes of performing commissives is to commit the speaker to the future actions. Its direction of fit is same with directives, that is, the world to a word or upward direction (↑). This means the successful performance of serious commissive is if the speaker fulfills his promise. The psychological state or sincerity condition expressed in performing commissive is the intention.
- d) **Expressive**
The illocutionary point of expressive is to express the psychological state included in its sincerity condition as to the state of affairs, which is indicated in the propositional content. Expressions have no direction of fit. In other words, the speakers' utterance has nothing to do with matching words to the world or otherwise. The psychological states expressed vary according to propositional attitude expressed in the propositional content. Some verbs for expressive are thank, congratulate, condole, deplore, welcome and so forth.
- e) **Declaratives**
Though Searle did not point out the illocutionary point of performing declarative, he argues that the success of its performance is subject to the change status of affairs as declared in propositional contents. The direction of fit of declarative is double direction or downward and upward direction (↕). This feature makes declarative special in terms of the successful performance. In this regard, there is assertive declarative in which the speaker asserts in advance according to the truth of reality. Then such an utterance brings about the change. In another world, there is a match between words and world. For instance, when a committee declares that 'I nominate you as the champions'. This declaration makes the given nominee the champion. As Searle points out the successful declaration require extra linguistic institution such as a legal institution or given institution with special authority and power.

In addition to illocutionary act (IA), though there are three important principles for distinguishing IA as previously mentioned, Searle notes there are twelve aspects that need taking into account in order to differentiate any kinds of illocutionary acts (IAs):

- a) Illocutionary point (purpose);
- b) The direction of fits;
- c) The expressed psychological states;
- d) Illocutionary force;
- e) The status of S and H;
- f) The relation between S's and H's interests;
- g) Relation to the rest of the discourse;
- h) Propositional content determined by IFIDs (illocutionary force indicating devices),
- i) Difference between those must always be speech acts and those can be, but need not be performed as speech acts;
- j) Difference between those acts that need an extra-linguistic institution for their performance and those are not;

- k) Difference between those where the corresponding illocutionary verbs have a performative use and those were not;
- l) And the style of performance.
(summarized from [Searle, 1968](#)).

Another classification of illocutionary acts proposed by Bach and Harnish is grounded on their assumption about the equivalence between illocutionary intention and relevant attitude expressed. Following Grice's notion on the important aspect of propositional attitude, their claim is that illocutionary intention can be successful depends on whether or not speakers (S) expressed attitudes are recognized by hearer (H). [Bach and Harnish \(1979\)](#) point out five categories of illocutionary acts:

- a) **Constatives**
It is to express speaker belief and intention. For Bach and Harnish, some types denote the patterns of constatives: (a) assertive like affirm, allege, avow, assert, claim, say, state; (b) predictive such as forecast, predict, and prophesy; (c) retroductive in the verbs recount and report; (d) descriptive includes appraise, assess, call, categorize, characterize, classify; (e) ascriptives, (f) informatives, (g) confirmatives, (h) concessive, (i) retractives, (j) assentives, (k) dissentives, (l) disputatives, (m) responsive, (n) suggestive, and (o) suppositives. These subdivisions of conservatives have verbs that overlap one another. As Bach and Harnish's note performing conservatives involves the speaker's belief and intention, which hearer in effect is intended to believe what a speaker utters to the hearer.
- b) **Directives**
Performing directives includes speakers' attitude to get hearer to do prospective actions. There are some subdivisions of directives: (a) requestives such as ask, beg, beseech, insist, implore, invite, pray, request, plead, petition; (b) question like ask, inquire, quiz; (c) requirement like bid, charge, command, demand, dictate, direct, enjoin, order; (d) prohibitive such as forbid, enjoin, proscribe, restrict; (e) permissive in verbs of agreeing too, allow, authorize, dismiss, forgive, pardon; and (f) advisories like admonish, advise, counsel, propose, suggest, warn, recommend and the rest.
- c) **Commissives**
These refer to acts which speaker puts himself under an obligation to do. In performing those acts, the speaker has the intention to do the further action obliged by himself. [Bach and Harnish \(1979\)](#) distinguish two types of commissives: (a) promises, and (b) offers. The former deals with the speaker obligating himself. The latter refers to the proposal obligating another. Some verbs that include in performing promises are a promise, swear, and vow. Subdivisions of promises are a contract, swear, guarantee and surrender. Subcategories of offers are volunteer and bidding.
- d) **Acknowledgments**
Acts involving feeling expressions towards the hearers by speakers are called acknowledgment. Some subcategories of acknowledgments apologize, condole, congratulate, greet, thank, bid, accept, reject.
- e) **Effective and Verdictives**
These acts are conventional illocutionary acts. For Bach and Harnish, the effect of performing effective and verdictive is the change of states of affairs. Verdictives are related to the judgment including the official binding to the context of situations. Both of these acts are subject to the conventional and institutional factors. Thus, in order to be successful, the speaker uttering these act must have right to perform it. Furthermore, such acts affect the change status including right and obligation generated. The instances of effective are a veto, graduate consecrates and so on. The different between verdictives and effective lies on the effect of its performance. Effective generates facts, while verdictives generate fact determined ([Bach and Harnish, 1979](#)). The examples of verdictives are assessing a piece of property, finding the defendant guilty and so on.

Based on Harnish's classification of speech acts grounded on the propositional attitude expressed, the verbs in each category overlap. For that reason, the distributions of verbs are unpredictable. In another word, there is inconsistency basis to classify illocutionary verbs under the categories of illocutionary acts. In addition, Bach and Harnish's classifications are similar to those of Austin's classification though they have a different foundation. In respect to Searle's taxonomy, propositional attitude as the only one base for Bach and Harnish in classifying illocutionary acts is lack due to the complexity of illocutionary acts. For Searle, Propositional attitude is one of

the necessary and sufficient conditions in performing speech acts. That is to say that other principles as suggested by Searle need to be into account for distinguishing illocutionary acts.

Other classifications of the types of illocutionary acts are proposed by some scholars (see, Katz, 1977; Croft, 1994; Sadock, 1994; Kissine, 2013; and Allan 2014). The categorizations of each type are based on expanding the previous foundation to provide an alternative classification. However, those other classifications are not discussed here because of the limitation and concern of the study.

The relationship between speech acts and language acquisition is commonly viewed that any kinds of speech act are an input to language learning. It is also believed that speech act as an element of communicative competence should be acquired by language learners in ESL and EFL context. Some earlier studies provide theoretical framework making the relation between speech acts and language acquisition.

Schmidt and Richard (1981) study about one aspect of communicative competences for learning language, speech acts. The study also concerns the contribution of speech act theory and language acquisition. They address some crucial problem looked at by scholars regarding with speech act theory ranging from (a) units and categories of speech acts (Searle, 1976; Fraser, 1975; Hancer, 1979), (b) the way to perform speech acts (Searle, 1965, 1975; Goffman, 1976; Grice, 1975), (c) meaning, deep structure and surface structure related to analyzing performatives (Ross, 1970; Sadock, 1970), (d) conversational postulates (Gordon and Lakoff, 1971), and (e) surface structure and context (Ervin-Tripp, 1976).

By reviewing such accounts on speech acts and events, Smith and Richard's analysis is also focused on the contribution of speech act theory and language acquisition, claiming that speech acts classification provides the crucial aspect of language learning as one of the communicative competencies required by either second language or foreign language learners. By comparing some studies about acquisition of the first language, especially speech acts, Smith and Richard reveal that most of studies concern the development of speech acts in young learners like (a) distinction between the instrumental and the regulatory functions of early language found by Halliday, 1975, (b) gradual grammaticization of child's pragmatic intention revealed by Dore, 1975, (c) two word stage children using assertions and requests pointed by Clark and Clark, 1977 and many other scholars.

For that reason, Smith and Richard examined second and foreign language learning and its relation to speech act theory. Following Swain's (1977) model of language learning, Smith and Richard take two parts of swain's model: (a) input factors, and (b) learner factors. Dealing with input factor, they suggest taking into account speech event and speech acts that include speech setting, discourse structure, and norms of speech events in terms of opening-closing sequence, turn-taking rules, sequencing rules, presupposition and speech act (like proposed by Sinclair & Coulthard, 1977).

In relation to the second part, learning factors, the related notions took from Swain's idea (1977) on the learning strategies for the acquisition of speech acts are an inference, transfer, generalization, and transfer of training (Smith and Richard, 1981). Inference refers to the process in which the learner makes a conclusion or hypothesis about the language on the basis of evidence presented. As Candlin (1978) notes, the inference is interpretive strategies for retrieving the discourse values from speech situation in order for the hearer to match interpretation of the speaker's utterance. Candlin's emphasis on the nature of discourse value is dynamic, or such discourse values depend on discourse type, participant relationship, setting, and topic. Even though the notion of inference is still questioned in speech act theory, even for a native speaker, Smith and Richard conclude that communication breakdown and misleading of non-fluent language user take place in the level of surface structure. In other words, they mainly focus on the propositional content on the basis of words or grammar. However, they fail to recognize marked speech act and functions.

Regarding with speech acts and communicative competence, the dispute between Hymes (1972) and Chomsky (1965) lie on the nature of competence needed by language user and especially language learner. As Chomsky emphasize, the importance of linguistic competence, including all aspect of language system such as phonology, syntax, semantics and so on. Those are competencies that must be mastered by language learners. On the other hand, Hymes (1968) argue that such linguistic competence is not enough for language learner in order to communicate effectively. For Hymes, communicative competence needs to be taught to language learners. As a result, the notion of communicative competence lead scholars to propose communicative language teaching, the teaching of speaking rules, the importance of teaching sociolinguistic, pragmatic, discourse competence, and the rest.

A model of communicative competence is proposed by Murcia, Dornyei, and Thurrel (1995). The model proposed consists of five components: (a) discourse competence, (b) linguistic competence, (c) actional competence, (d) sociocultural competence, and (e) strategic competence (Cf. Canale and Swain (1980). As

Murcia et al (1995) notes, discourse competence deals with the ability to select and arrange 'words, structures, sentence, and utterance in order to produce a unity of spoken or written text. A number of core elements have a contribution to discourse competence including cohesion, deixis, coherence, generic structure, turn-taking systems. For them, this competence is where the interrelation of bottom-up lexicon-grammatical microlevel, top-down signal macrolevel of intention, sociocultural context (attitudes and messages (see table 1 for more details in Murcia et al, 1995, p. 14).

The second component, linguistic component, is related the sentence patterns and types, morphological inflections, the constituent structure, lexemes, phonological and orthographic systems. The third part, actional competence deals with the ability to convey and understand the communicative intention, in this sense that competence is very close to the ability to match intention and linguistic form on the basis of schemata knowledge entailing the illocutionary force of speech acts. For them, this competence is intertwined with interlanguage pragmatic. As Kasper and Kulka define that interlanguage pragmatic concerns with 'non-native speaker use and acquisition of linguistic action pattern in a second language' (p.3).

The next part refers to sociocultural competence. It refers to speakers' ability for appropriate expression in delivering messages according to the context of society and culture grounded on pragmatic factors, which has variety in the use of language. Murcia et al (1995) divide sociocultural competence into four main parts: (a) social contextual factors, (b) stylistic appropriateness, (c) cultural factors, and (d) non-verbal communication factor.

The final element of communicative competence proposed is strategic competence. It is related to speakers' ability of communication strategy and ability to use such strategies. In this respect, the strategy covers language process, language learning, and language production. Murcia et al (1995) also point out three functions of strategy use from different perspectives which are commonly adopted in communicative language teaching: (a) psycholinguistic perspective, communication strategies are seen as speaker's verbal plan to achieve the purpose of communication such as avoiding trouble spot or compensating the lack of vocabulary; (b) interactional perspectives, communication strategies refers to speaker's appeal for help involving co-problem solving such as negotiating meaning and repair mechanism; and (c) maintenance perspective, communication strategies deal with speakers' effort to keep communication open by means of utilizing time for thinking and making the plan of speech. Based on these perspectives, Murcia et al mentions five parts of strategic competence:

- a) Avoidance or reduction strategies involve replacing messages, avoiding the topic, and leaving a message;
- b) Achievement strategies include circumlocution, approximation, all-purpose words, non-linguistic means, restructuring, word coinage, a literal translation from L1, foreignizing, codeswitching, and retrieval;
- c) Stalling or time-gaining strategies cover fillers, hesitation and gambits and self and other repetition;
- d) Self-monitoring strategies are related to self-initiated repair and self-rephrasing;
- e) And interactional strategies deal with an appeal for help (direct/indirect), meaning negotiation, response and comprehension checks.

Based on the model of communicative competence proposed by Murcia et al (1995), the account is comprehensive as theoretical for language learning, which becomes a crucial aspect of language teaching and learning. The communicative competence has become an interesting topic for designing communicative language teaching. Furthermore, in ESL and EFL context, speech act as one aspect of communicative competence has been studied by many scholars (Wolfson, Kulka, Ellis, Cohen and so on). A study focuses on measuring student competence of one particular types of speech act, such as an apology, request, compliment and so on. Most of the studies seem to relate speech act, language acquisition and communicative competence and classroom interaction.

2. Research Methods

The approach used is a pragmatic approach. It grounds to classify types of speech act performance in classroom interaction between teachers and students. Searle's taxonomy of illocutionary act is used for such classification. However, in this study, the principles of pragmatic, conversation and discourse analysis are integrated into analyzing and examining types and frequency of speech acts, and strategies used in performing an illocutionary act of imperatives.

In accordance with the purposes of this study, a qualitative method is used in analyzing the gathered data. The recording and observation are used to collect data in order to achieve the purposes of the study: (a) types and

frequency of speech acts performed, and (b) communication strategies reflecting students' communicative competence.

Three English teachers and 30 male students grade IX of MTs NW Putra Nurul Haramain are the participants in this study. They are informants of the study in which their spoken language during interaction is recorded. The participants' ages are: teachers range from 27 to 40 years old and the students in the age of 16 years old. They have different cultural backgrounds, knowledge, and ethics (like Sasaknese, Javanese, Bimanese, and Samawa). For the teachers, most of them are Sasaknese who use Sasak language as their first language.

In this study, data are collected authentically from the participant's conversation. The data collected are natural since the conversations take place inside and outside the classroom. Such data are empirical and natural on the basis the factual information. Therefore, in order to achieve those kinds of data, observation and recording are the techniques used.

Those are used to collect the data from the teachers and students' conversations in order to get their speech behaviors covering types and frequency of speech acts performed and communication strategies reflecting their pragmatic competencies, ranging from different speech situation and events. Moreover, observation is used to look at participants' activities directly in different situations to get the accurate data.

To get natural data in this study is through recording during communication processes. The data recording covers teacher-students and students-students interaction inside and outside the classroom. First, teacher talks are recorded when they have presented the material in the class. Then, teachers' interactions with students are also recorded. The last, student-student interactions are recorded in order to get data giving information as to the types of speech acts and communication strategies used in the realization of imperatives.

3. Results and Analysis

Based on data collected and analyzed, four types of speech act are performed: (a) imperatives, (b) Assertive, (c) expressions, and (d) commissive. The following presents types of speech acts based on its illocutionary forces.

A. Imperatives

Based on data collected, There are eight subcategories of imperatives found as shown in lines (1)-(8): question, request, suggestion, hope, instructing, inviting, prohibit and order respectively. Those classifications are based on the illocutionary forces and its components.

- (1) T: So how many friends do you have? (question)
- (2) T: Please, remember what I say that you have as Muslim. (request)
- (3) T: You should do this if you want to make a good friend. (suggestion)
- (4) T: be smart as you can. (hope)
- (5) T: listen carefully. (instructing)
- (6) T: let's open by reciting Basmalah.
- (7) T: Whenever you find double /o/ but not like a door, you cannot read it /dor/. (prohibit)
- (8) T: so work in a group. (order)

Illocutionary forces and the components of imperatives

Illocutionary point

| Subtypes of imperative | Illocutionary points |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (1) T: So how many friends do you have? (question) | The teacher tries to get students answer the question |
| (2) T: Please, remember what I say that you have to do as Muslim. (request) | The teacher request students remember what students have to do as Moslem. |
| (3) T: You should do this if you want to make a good friend. (suggestion) | The teacher suggests the students do something for making a good friend. |
| (4) T: be smart as you can. (hope) | The teacher expects the student to be smart. |
| (5) T: listen carefully. (instructing) | The teacher wants the student to listen to her. |
| (6) Let's open by reciting <i>Basmalah</i> (inviting) | The teacher invites their students to recite <i>Basmalah</i> together. |
| (7) T: Whenever you find double /o/ but not like a door, you cannot read it /dor/. (prohibit) | The teacher wants the student not to read door as */do/, though it is double /oo/. |
| (8) T: so work in a group. (order) | The teacher asks the students to work with their |

groups.

1. The degree of the strength of the illocutionary point.

The degree of strength for each subcategory of imperatives varies: (a) order is stronger than a request, and (b) suggestion is lesser degree than those of instruct, request, prohibit, and order. It can be like order>prohibit>request>inviting>instruct>suggestion>question>hope

2. Mode of achievement

Order, instruct and prohibit achieve its points by means of teacher's authorities used. Meanwhile, request, suggestion, inviting, question and hope need not have a special way of achieving the point. In other words, to achieve the points, the speaker is not required to have the power to perform the request, question, inviting, suggestion and hope.

3. Propositional content condition

The types of forces are interrelated to what can be in its propositional contents. In this cases, their propositional contents are (a) in *order* the teacher wants to get student to work in their group, (b) in *request*, the teacher's want the student to remember of what they have to do as Muslim, (c) in teacher's *suggest*, the teachers' ask the student answer the question, and (d) the students suggest the other students to do as she suggests, (e) the teacher hopes the student to be a smart, (f) the teacher asks the student listen to her, and (g) the teacher invite the student to recite *Basmalah* together.

4. Preparatory condition

As in lines (1)-(8) question, request, suggestion, hope, instruct, inviting, prohibit and order, their preparatory condition is the students are able to do what the teacher asks them. In other words, students are able (a) to answer the questions, and (b) to perform what the teacher requested, ordered and suggested, instructed, invited, prohibited and ordered respectively.

5. Sincerity condition

As shown in lines (1)-(8), the teacher perform sincere imperatives, that is, the teacher has the desire and wants that student to do the action questioned, requested, ordered, invited, instructed, expected, prohibited and suggested.

6. The degree of the strength of sincerity condition

The degree of strength varies. As seen in line (8), the teacher has a stronger desire and wants for the students to do the acts ordered. Otherwise, as in lines (1)-(7), those indicate the teacher has the desire but has lesser one than that in *order* as in line (4).

B. Assertiveness

There are eleven subcategories of assertions found in teacher-student interaction as indicated in lines (9) – (17): informing, answer, assert, stating, assuming, concluding, categorizing, recount, accepting, agreeing.

(9) T : After this, every group will perform here. (*inform*)

(10) T : In Islam, there are some obligations you should know as a friend. (*assert*)

(11) T : That is one character to be a true friend. (*conclude*)

(12) S : if our friend sick, we must visit. (*assuming*)

(13) T : Ok. That are some obligations in Islam. (*confirming*)

(14) Ss : Yes, [I do like a story] of course. (*accepting*)

(15) T : Hasan Basri was felt sick. (*recount*)

(16) Ss : of course [we know the names]. (*answering*)

(17) Ss : yes we agree (*friend's ideas*).

Illocutionary forces and its components of assertive

Illocutionary points

The following is the illocutionary points of assertive

| Subtypes of assertive | Illocutionary points |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| (9) T: After this, every group will perform here. (inform) | The teacher tells the student what they will do next. |
| (10) T: In Islam, there are some obligations you should | The teacher tells the student a number of |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| know as a friend. (assert) | obligations they need to know. |
| (11) T: That is one character to be a true friend. (conclude) | The teacher tells one of nature to be a good friend. |
| (12) S: if our friend sick, we must visit.(assuming) | The student believes that visiting our friend, when they are sick is one of the ways to be a good friend. |
| (13) T: Ok. That are some obligations in Islam.(confirming) | The teacher confirms what the students say are obliged to Muslims. |
| (14) Ss: Yes, [I do like a story] of course. (accepting) | The students tell by responding that they like a short story. |
| (15) T: Hasan Basri was felt sick.(recount) | The teacher recount Hasan Basri's condition. |
| (16) Ss: of course [we know the names]. (answering) | The teacher answer that they know their friend's name. |
| (17) Ss: yes we agree (agree with friend's ideas). | The students tell that they agree with their friends' ideas. |

1. The degree of the strength of illocutionary points

Asserting as in line (10) has a stronger degree than that of assumption as in line (12). In this respect, the teacher asserts his belief in the truth of some obligations in Islam. It involves teacher's belief to the truth of being asserted and the source of what asserted. Furthermore, the teacher has broader knowledge of Islam than that of students. Meanwhile, student's assumption involves his thought according to their knowledge. In this case, the students need confirmation as in line (13) whether or not their assumptions are true. This is also shown that confirmation needs an authority with knowledge and competence in order to make a confirmation as in line (13). The rest subtypes, informing (9), concluding (11), accepting (14) recount (15) answering (16), agreeing (17) have no degree of strength in achieving the illocutionary point.

2. Mode of achievement

Not all types of speech acts require a special way in order to achieve its illocutionary points. In this case, only two subtypes of assertive held in the interaction of teacher-students: (a) informing as in line (9) and (b) confirming as in line (13). Informing in this respect is related to telling about what is going to do during the lesson. To perform this act, it requires power or authority. By performing such an act, the teacher has an authority to tell what activity is in teaching and learning process. Moreover, in order to give confirmation on something being case, it requires a speaker who has a power or an authority derived from status and degree of knowledge and competence. In this case, the teacher has such a power to confirm whether or not students' ideas are true. Both informing and confirming require authority in order to achieve its illocutionary point. By this way, speech performed can be successful and not defective.

3. Propositional content conditions

The force of each type has relation with its proposition. In this types, as seen in lines (9)-(17) they are *inform, assert, conclude, assume, confirm, accept, recount and agreeing*. The contents of each proposition are the speaker's belief and the truth of proposition being informed, asserted, concluded and so forth.

4. Preparatory conditions

As shown in lines (9)-(17), the speaker assertion presuppose background knowledge on the truth of what being asserted. In other words, before performing such acts, the speaker needs to have a belief in the truth of proposition asserted. Without such condition, the speech act performed is successful but defective.

5. Sincerity condition

Dealing with this criterion, the sincerity condition of assertive is a speaker's belief. It is shown in lines (9)-(17). In other words, either teacher or students involve his belief to the content of proposition asserted.

6. The degree of the strength of sincerity condition

The degree of belief to the content of proposition varies depend on knowledge and source of knowledge. As shown in line (9)-(17), the Speaker has strong belief that what she asserted is true. Meanwhile, the students have a lesser degree of belief to what they assume about the characteristic to be a true friend.

C. Expressives

There are three subtypes of expressions found: *greeting*, *thank*, and *compliment* in teacher-student interaction as shown in lines (18-21).

(18) T: How's life today? (*greeting*)

(19) T: Thanks. (*thank*)

(20) T: Ok. Good. (*compliment*)

The illocutionary point of expressive

| Expressive | Illocutionary point |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18) T: How's life today? (<i>greeting</i>) | Teacher express likeness and happiness to meet her students. |
| (19) T: Thanks. (<i>thank</i>) | Teacher expresses her gratitude on student presence and performance. |
| (20) T: Ok. Good. (<i>compliment</i>) | The teacher expresses the pride of students' performance. |
| (21) T: Very good (<i>compliment</i>) | |

1. The degree of the strength of illocutionary point.

As shown in lines (18) and (19), there has no degree of strength in achieving its illocutionary points. However, in lines (20) and (21), they have a degree of strength in achieving the points. In this case, compliment as in line (21) has a stronger degree to achieve the point of a compliment than that of a compliment as in line (20).

2. Mode of achievement

There is no mode of achievement needed by speaker or hearer in order to achieve its illocutionary point. In other words, in order to perform *greeting*, *thank*, and *compliment* as in lines (18, 19, 20, and 21) respectively, special ways such as power or an authority is not needed in performing those acts.

3. Propositional content condition.

In line (18), the propositional content of *greeting* has to do with teacher's happy feeling to meet students. The content of *thank* as in line (19) is teacher gratitude to students' attention during the lesson. Meanwhile, as shown in lines (20) and (22), *compliment* contains the teacher's acceptance and pride to what students have done, that is they have given good performance in presenting their ideas about the characteristic of a good friend.

4. Preparatory condition

In performing speech act, it can be both successful and non-defective. Regarding with these types as shown in line (18, 19, 20, and 21), the speaker and student express true feeling; happiness, gratitude, and pride respectively.

5. Sincerity condition

As shown in lines (18-21), the speakers, the teachers as well as students express their attitude that they are really happy to meet the student; the teachers truly appreciate students' attention, and the teachers are completely happy and proud of students' performance.

6. The degree of sincerity condition

Since *greeting* and *thank* as in lines (18-19) use simple devices to express the forces, they have no degree of strength of sincerity condition. On the other hand, compliment as in lines (20-21), they have a different degree of strength though they are same force. In this case, the teacher's compliment as in line (21) has a stronger degree in expressing his happiness and pride of what the students perform.

D. Commissives

There is only a subtype of commissives found, that is *promising* as shown in lines (22)-(24).

(22) T: I will give you three candies. (*promising*)

(23) T: I will ask you about what do you talk about the clean life.

(24) S: ok. [accept to tell the steps]

The illocutionary point of promising as in line (22) is committing the teacher to give students candy if they are right in answering the question. In this case, promising has no degree of strength of illocutionary point,

mode of achievement and degree of strength of sincerity condition. The propositional content condition of promise is teacher commit herself to give the candy in the future. In relation to a preparatory condition, the teacher has the ability to give it and the students are interested in having the candy. Regarding with sincerity condition, the teacher completely has intention to give candy to the students.

Based on the result of this study, there are four types of speech acts performed in the interaction of teacher-students: imperatives, assertive, expressions and commissives. The classification is grounded on the illocutionary force and its component including illocutionary point, the degree of strength of illocutionary point, mode of achievement, propositional content condition, preparatory condition, sincerity condition, and degree of strength of sincerity condition.

Dealing with imperatives, there are eight subcategories found the question, request, suggestion, hope, instructing, inviting, prohibit an order as shown in lines (1)-(8). They are classified according to illocutionary force and its components. In relation to the first component, the illocutionary point of those subcategories of imperatives, the point or purpose is to get hearer to do something. The second component pertained to the degree of strength of illocutionary point, *order* as in line (8) is the strongest degree in achieving the point of other subcategories as in lines (1)-(7).

Next component is the mode of achievement that is related to the way of achieving the point or purpose of the illocutionary point. In this case, illocutionary act of *order* requires a special way in order to achieve its point. In this respect, the teacher has a power or an authority in the interaction, so that it can achieve the point. For the rest subcategories of imperative, they do not need specific ways to achieve the point.

In relation to what the contents of any kinds of speech act, it has to do with the propositional content condition. In this condition, as shown in lines (1) –(8), the content of proposition must be the teacher's want/desire that students do as stated in the proposition: (a) the propositional contents of *order* is the teacher want to get student to work in their group, (b) *request*, the teacher's want the student to remember what they have to do as Muslim, (c) *instruct*, the teachers' ask the student answer the question, (d) *suggest*, the students suggest the other students do as she suggested, (e) *hope*, the teacher hope the student to be a smart, (f) *instruct*, the teacher asks the student listen to her, and (g) *invite*, the teacher invited the student to recite *Basmalah* together.

The fourth component is the preparatory condition. In these subtypes, the student must be able to perform the action as stated in the proposition. In this respect, they are able to perform what the teacher requested, ordered and suggested, instructed, invited, prohibited and ordered as shown in lines (1-8). If this preparatory condition is not satisfied, imperatives performed are successful but non-defective. Its preparatory condition is imposed for the purposes of the illocutionary point. That is to say, all subtypes of imperatives, in this case, require that the hearer must be able to do the action as the preparatory condition. It is in line with Searle and Vanderveken (2001) who assert that hearer's ability to do the act as ordered, requested, suggested and so on.

There is a correspondence between speech act performed and the psychological state expressed. It is related to the fifth component of illocutionary force, that is sincerity condition. Regarding with subcategories of imperative as in lines (1)-(8) including the question, request, suggestion, hope, instructing, inviting, prohibit and order respectively, its sincerity condition is a speaker or students' desire. For that reason, if a speaker gives the order, request and so on without having the desire or wants, given imperatives are defectives. In other words, though speech acts performed is successful but it is defective. For the last component, the degree of strength of sincerity condition, illocutionary acts of *prohibit* and *order* as in lines (7)-(8) respectively has a stronger degree than those of *question*, *request*, *suggestion*, *hope*, *instructing*, *inviting*.

The second types of speech act or illocutionary act found is assertive. Eleven subcategories of assertions are found in this study as shown in line (9) –(20) including *informing*, *answer*, *assert*, *stating*, *assuming*, *concluding*, *categorizing*, *recount*, *accepting*, *agreeing*. These subcategories are classified on the basis of its force and components.

Regarding with the first component, the illocutionary point of assertions is to tell how things are. Thus, as in lines (9), the point of assertions is to tell how learning process will be in which the teacher gives information to the students about what the class is going to be. In line (10), the point is that the teacher tells the student about some of the obligation as Muslims. In line (16), the illocutionary point is that the students tell the teacher that they know their true friend's name and so forth. This core component of assertive indicates that the purpose or the point of assertive correspond to the forces need to be achieved, unless its performance is unsuccessful.

For the next component, the degree of strength in achieving the point, Asserting as in line (10) has a stronger degree than that of assumption as in line (12). In this respect, the teacher asserts his belief on the truth of some obligation in Islam. It involves the teacher's belief in the truth of being asserted and the source of what asserted. Furthermore, the teacher has broader knowledge of Islam than that of students. Meanwhile, student's assumption involves his thought according to their knowledge. In this case, the students need confirmation as in line (13) whether or not their assumptions are true. This is also shown that confirmation needs an authority with knowledge and competence in order to make a confirmation as in line (13). The rest subtypes, *informing* (9), *concluding* (11), *accepting* (14) *recount* (15) *answering* (16), and *agreeing* (17) have no degree of strength in achieving the illocutionary point. This indicates that degree of strength of assertive may vary according to nature of subcategories.

A number of speech acts can achieve the points by means of specific ways. This is related to the mode of achievement. In this types, only two subtypes of assertive held in the interaction of teacher-students: (a) informing as in line (9) and (b) confirming as in line (13). *Informing* in this respect is related to telling about what is going to do during the lesson. To perform this act, it needs a power or an authority. Thus, in this regard, the teacher has an authority to tell about what activity is in teaching and learning process. Moreover, in order to give confirmation on something being case, it needs a speaker who has a power or an authority derived from status and degree of knowledge and competence. In this case, the teacher has such a power to confirm whether or not students' ideas are true. Both informing and confirming require the authority in order to achieve its illocutionary point. By this way, speech performed can be successful and not defective. In other words, if the speaker performs those acts without having such a power or authority, the given speech act performed is defective.

In respect to the content of a proposition, it refers to the propositional content condition. The force of each type has relation with its proposition. In this types, as seen in lines (9)-(17), the propositional content of *inform*, *assert*, *conclude*, *assume*, *confirm*, *accept*, *recount* and *agreeing* are the speaker's belief and the truth of proposition being *informed*, *asserted*, *concluded* and so forth. This condition is required in order assertive performed to be successful and nondefective. Suppose the teacher, in this case, has no belief on the truth of what she asserts to the student, and then she makes a lie to her students. For that reason, in performing assertive, the speaker needs to have such belief corresponding to the truth of the content of the proposition.

As indicated in lines (9)-(17), the speakers' assertions presuppose background knowledge on the truth of what being asserted. This condition refers to the preparatory condition. For instance, the teacher asserts that some obligation to be a true friend. This presupposes that the teacher has background knowledge of obligations Muslim. It is similar to other subcategories including *concluding*, *answering*, *confirming* and the rest, to perform these actions, requiring background knowledge on the truth of thing asserted in order that speech act performed is successful and non-defective.

When we speak, especially in performing any kinds of speech act, we express not only the propositional content but also the psychological state. In relation to the psychological state expressed, it deals with sincerity condition of assertive. Ranging from lines (9)-17), speakers either teacher or students expressed their belief corresponding to the content of the proposition. This condition needs fulfilling in order the assertive performed to be successful and non-defective. Thus, the psychological state expressed in performing assertive is speaker's belief on the truth of given propositional content. Furthermore, that belief may have a degree of strength. In this respect, as shown in line (10), Speaker has strong belief that what she asserts is true. Meanwhile, the student has a lesser degree of belief to what they assume about the characteristic to be a true friend. This means that level of belief of speaker is determined by status and level of competence or knowledge to the proposition asserted. Above all, all conditions as criteria of assertive corroborate with [Searle and Vanderveken \(2001\)](#) illocutionary force and component of assertive. This result also is in line with [Junaidi's study \(2016\)](#) who classify speech act performed in formal and in an informal setting in the Sasak speech community.

The third type of speech act found was expressive. Based on the result of the study, there are three subcategories of expressive found as shown in lines (18)-(20), including *greeting*, *thank* and *compliment*. Those were classified based on its forces and components. The illocutionary point of expressive varies according to the proposition. In this cases, *greeting* as in line (18) has a point that the speaker expresses her happiness to meet the hearer or students. *Thank* as seen in line (19) has a point that the speaker expresses her gratitude for students' attention and attendance to the class. *Compliments* as shown in lines (20) and (21)

indicate that its illocutionary points are that the speaker expresses her pride and happiness on the students' response to teacher's question.

In relation to the degree of strength of illocutionary point, the only compliment has a degree of the strength. *Compliment*, as shown in line (21), has a stronger degree than that of a compliment as in line (20). This is due to the linguistic device used to express such a compliment in which in line 21 the speaker add intensifier of *very* before *good*. That makes that compliment has point that is stronger. Meanwhile, the rest as in lines (18-19), *greeting* and *thank* respectively have no degree of strength. In respect to the third component, mode of achievement, any subcategories have no mode of achievement. In other words, the speaker does not require an authority of power in order to perform *greeting, thank and compliment*.

The next element has to do with the propositional content of *expressions*. The content of *greeting* is about teacher's happy feeling to meet students. The content of *thank* as in line (19) is the teacher's gratitude to students' attention during the lesson. Meanwhile, as shown in lines (20) and (22), *compliments* contain the teacher acceptance and pride to what students have done, that is they have given good performance in presenting their ideas about the characteristic of a good friend. That is to say, the study finding of the content of proposition is in line with Searle (1969); Searle and Vanderveken (2001) who assert that propositional content of *expressions* varies according to its forces.

The next element also determines whether or not any given speech act performed are successful and non-defective. Regarding with these types as shown in lines (18, 19, 20, and 21), the speaker and students presuppose to express a true feeling: *happiness, gratitude, and pride* respectively. This is essential for the speaker to express what he really feels about something or to someone else. It seems without expressing true feeling those expressions performed are successful but still defective.

A speaker performs a speech act by expressing the propositional content as well as psychological state expressed. As shown in lines (18-21), the speakers, teacher as well as students, express his attitude that they are really happy to meet the student; the teacher truly appreciates students' attention, and the teacher completely happy and proud of students' performance. This indicates that the sincerity condition of expressive has variation according to speaker attitude and proposition. For the last element, that is its degree of strength of sincerity condition, *greeting* and *thank* as in lines (18-19) use a simple device to express the force. Furthermore, they have no degree of strength of sincerity condition. On the other hand, *compliments* as in lines (20-21) have different degrees of strength though they are same force. In this case, *compliment* as in line (21) has a stronger degree in expressing its happiness and pride of what the students perform. Actually, this finding support Searle's (1969) notion sincerity condition of expressions.

The fourth types of speech acts found the interaction of teacher and students are commissives as seen in lines (22)-(24). These examples are commissive on the basis of illocutionary force and component. The first component, the illocutionary point of *promising*, it is to commit the speaker to doing something as promised in the content of the proposition. As in line (22), the teacher commits herself to give the students candy. As seen in line (23), the teacher commits herself to ask the question after the student talk about the clean life of their group members. And as indicated in line (23), the student accepts to do as the teacher instructs. Thus, by performing such acts, they *commit* themselves to tell the steps of cleaning. This indicates that two kinds of commitment involved: (a) I-commitment, and (b) We-commitment. In this respect, such acts involve individual intention and collective intention in performing those commissive respectively.

In relation to the degree of strength of achieving the point, promising as in line (23) shows that have stronger degree than those of promising as in lines (21)-(22) since it includes mutual intention and commitment. This naturally brings the speaker and hearer bound by collective intention and commitment. Otherwise, *promising* in the rest lines shows that they are individual in nature. This difference also affects the next component, the mode of achievement. In this component, promising that involve collective intention require mutual recognition and acceptance before they are committed to their commitment to do as promised. In other words, in order to achieve the point, the speaker and hearer need to have mutual recognition and acceptance. Otherwise, as in line (21)-(22) those acts do not require such way in order to achieve its point.

That propositional content condition of commissives are (a) the speaker's intention to give candy as in line (21), (b) the teacher will ask the student in the future (22), and (c) the students will explain the steps of cleaning life after discussing their group member (23). This indicates that support Searle and Vanderveken (2001) notion about the propositional content of commissions, that is the speaker will perform the course of action in the future.

Though commission is successful in achieving the point, it is still defective if they fail to obtain the preparatory condition. In this case, the preparatory condition includes: (a) the teacher's promise to give candies to students who are interested as the hearer and student want their teacher to give them candies, (b) It also cover the teacher asking question that corresponds to the students' interest and the students want that teacher ask them, and (c) student explaining the step of clean life is in teacher interest and the teacher want the student tell about it. These show that in performing assertive it requires hearer interest and hearer want the speaker to do as promised.

Regarding with sincerity condition, it deals with psychological state expressed when performing commissions. In this case, as in lines (21) and (22), the sincerity condition is the individual intention. Meanwhile, as a line (23), it involves collective intention. If the speaker performs those commissives without having the corresponding intention, the commissives performed are successful but defective. For that reason, on the one hand, the teacher promising to give candies must have the intention to give those candies. On the other hand, students promising to tell the cleaning life must have collective intention to perform the act promised. For the last component, the promise involving collective commitment has a stronger degree of intention since it involves collective commitment to be performed.

Based on this study, the necessary conditions that are internal to speech act involving the force and its component might be criteria for speech act classification: illocutionary point, the degree of strength in achieving the point, mode of achievement, propositional content condition, preparatory condition, sincerity condition and degree of strength of sincerity condition. Those can be the foundation that can be used to distinguish and classify speech act perform. Furthermore, it can be used as a number of apparatuses that is useful for determining whether or not speech acts or illocutionary act performed successful and non-defective. Above all, the result of study dealing with classification, force and component is in line with [Searle \(1969\)](#), [Searle and Vanderveken \(2001\)](#); [Junaidi \(2016\)](#) and so on.

The Number of Speech Act Performance

Based on data collected, four types of speech acts were found: imperatives, assertive, expressions and commissions. During the interaction of teacher and students, the following table shows the frequency of how many times they are performed either by teacher and students.

| Types of speech acts | Assertiveness | Imperatives | Expressives | Commissives | Total |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| Amount | 117 | 120 | 34 | 7 | 278 |
| % | 42 | 43 | 12 | 2.5 | |

There are about 278 instances types of speech acts performed. Of the total number of speech acts, 120 acts or 43% are imperatives. It is dominant types of speech performed. Assertiveness performed are about 117 acts or 42%. It is dominant. Meanwhile, the acts of expressions are 34 acts or 12%. It is less dominant. The last commissives performed are 7 acts or 2.5%. It is not dominant types of speech act performed.

According to this study, 278 instances of speech acts types performed are found. Of the total number of speech acts, 120 acts or 43% are imperatives. It is dominant types of speech performed. Assertiveness performed are about 117 acts or 42%. It is dominant. Meanwhile, the acts of expressions are 34 acts or 12%. It is less dominant. The last commissives performed are 7 acts or 2.5%. It is not dominant types of speech act performed. For that reason, the most dominant of speech act type are imperatives followed by assertive, expressions and commissions. Based on this finding, this supports that the teacher needs to give linguistic forms and devices that can be used by a student in performing imperatives, assertive, expressions and commissions. By providing this knowledge, the teacher can improve communicative competence including linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competence. This shows us that the teacher is dominant in performing speech acts. It is shown by the number of speech act performed uttered by the teacher. The teacher dominance in uttering speech act corroborate with [Merdana at., al \(2013\)](#).

Based on this study, a number of speech used by the teacher is mainly used to control, manage and encourage the student in the learning process. It is in line with [Johnson \(1997\)](#) who believed that speech performed has instructional functions such as controlling, managing, and motivating the class. This study is also in line with [Searle \(1969\)](#) who assert that in relation to speech act performed directive is frequently used in classroom interaction.

The Strategies Used in Performing Speech Acts

The following description and classification of strategies and linguistic devices used in performing illocutionary acts of imperatives are found in the interaction of teacher and students.

A. Formal completeness

1. Propositional completeness

- a. –verb
(23) S: Miss, Miss, candy.
- b. + verb
(24) S: give us a gift.
Give-v us-pro present-n
Give us a present

2. Modification

- a. Internal
 - i. Downgrade
(25) T: please work in a group.
 - ii. Upgrade
(26) T: take your time!
(27) T: take your time.
- b. External
 - i. Downgrade (giving a reason for the request)
(28) T: be a good friend because we are Muslims.
 - ii. Upgrade (adding an insult)

B. Level of Directness

1. Direct

- a. Mood derivable (the grammatical mood of verb signal the IF)
(29) T: you keep listen first.
- b. Performative (illocutionary force named explicitly)
(30) I let you raise your hand.
- c. Hedged performative (IF is modified by hedging expression)
(31) I would like you to be a good friend.
- d. Locution derivable (the IF is derived from semantic content)
(32) S: I *ingin itu* (student want candy as a reward)
I-p want-v it-p
I want it
- e. Conventionally indirect
 - a) Suggester formula
(33) T: come forward, let's play a game.
 - b) Query preparatory
(34) T: can you repeat one more time!
- f. Nonconventional indirect
 - a) Strong hint
(35) T: Read this together (teacher show the yellow card with a sentence written on it)
 - b) Mild hint (no reference of the object)
There are no kinds of this found in this study.

C. Perspectives

- a) Speaker
(36) S: Can I have [a] marker?
- b) Hearer
(37) T: can you spell the word?
- c) Both (inclusive)
(38) T: Let's recite Basmalah.

- d) Neither /impersonal
(39) T: it would be good to be a true friend.

D. Context

- a) Addressee
 - [1] Adult (teacher)
[2] Other young students.
- b) Interactive goal
 - [1] Core
Most of imperatives used are in pedagogic discourse.
(40) T: give applause.
 - [2] Framework
Some imperative used as classroom management behavior.
(41) T: let me take one by one!
 - [3] Social
A number of imperatives are used for social relation.
(42) T: you should say Havdalah before telling how you are.
(43) T: you should do this if you want to make a good friend.

E. Mood

- a) Positive
(44) T: remember the new words you listen.
- b) Negative
(45) T: don't read /dur/ though it has double /oo/.

F. Purposes

- a) Good
(46) Miss, candy!
- b) Services
(47)T: Hold this for a while (asking a student to hold the marker)
- c) Attention
(48) T: Look at the card!
- d) Pedagogic activity
(49) T: Repeat after me.
- e) Action
(50) T: Raise your hand.

The focus of the study is also strategies used in performing an illocutionary act of imperative, especially request. Following [Blum Kulka & House \(1989\)](#) and [Ellis \(1996\)](#), regarding with formal completeness, it includes propositional completeness and modification. As shown in lines (23)-(24), the students perform a *request* with a verb and without a verb. In fulfilling such propositional completeness, the students seem to perform the request in terms of verbless and verb. Meanwhile, either teachers or students perform request by means of internal and external modification. For internal modification, the teacher downgrades her request by adding *please* as seen in line (25) and upgrading her request without using *please* as in line (26). Dealing with external modification, the teacher downgrades the request by giving a reason, that is, reason about to be a good friend as shown in line (28).

Another component of performing imperatives is a level of directness covering *mood derivable*, *performative*, *hedged performative*, *locution derivable*, and *conventionally indirect*. As shown in line (29), the use of grammatical mood indicates the direct request in the form of declarative. In this case, the teacher addresses the whole student in the class. Furthermore, the teacher uses performatives to give a direct request as shown in line (30). In this respect, the teacher explicitly names the force of imperative. This is in line with [Austin \(1962\)](#) in which request is realized through performative.

Another way of performing request is by using hedged performative. As shown in line (31), the teacher makes a request by hedging her performance by using modal, *would*. That is to say, the teacher modifies the request by means of hedged performative. The level of directness by using modality such a modal verb is used in teacher and student interaction. Thus, it supports Fraser (1975) idea about hedged performative as the way to realize request.

Regarding with locution derivable, the students make a request to the teacher in which the force is derived from the content of semantic. In this case, the student is requesting the candy to the teacher. In addition to conventionally indirect, the teacher uses suggestive formula as seen in line (32). In this case, the teacher suggests the students come forward to the class and ask them to play a game. Another way to perform it is by using query formula. As shown in line (33), the teacher requests the student by means of a question. Using such a query formula, it is in line with Searle (1975) notion about indirect speech act in which the question can be used to realize request.

For the last unit non-conventionally indirect in terms of and strong mild hint, as shown in line (34), the teacher uses strong hint by pointing the card to the student. Meanwhile, for the latter, the study could not find the limitation of data collection.

The next unit is dealt with the point of view or perspective used in performing imperatives. Actually, when we speak the language, the speakers use reference in order to emphasize the entity in terms of the speaker, hearer, and action. It is similar to what happen in performing imperatives, especially requests. As seen in lines (36)-(39), the emphasis is on the speaker (students), hearer (students), both speaker and hearer (teacher and student), and neither speaker nor hearer respectively. This finding supports Blum-Kulka & House (1989) who assert that in performing request, the realization of request might highlight the point of view: speaker, hearer, both speaker and hearer, and neither speaker nor hearer.

For the next unit in performing the request, it is context including addressee and interactive goal. In this study, the addressee covers the teacher and young student. In relation to the interactive goal, the realization of request performed covers core, framework and social goal as seen in lines (40)-(43). Request is performed by a teacher that functions as (a) pedagogic discourse as in line (40), (b) classroom management as in line (41), and (c) showing the social relationship as in lines (42)-(43). Based on this finding, it supports Ellis's study (1992) and Blum-Kulka & House (1989) who assert that in performing request it cover the context consist of addressee and interactive goal.

Regarding with mood, in performing the request, a requestor may realize such requests in terms of positive and negative moods. In this study, the former mood is shown in line (44) in which the teacher makes a request by using positive mood. Meanwhile, for the latter, the teacher uses negative mood as in line (45). This indicates that mood used either positive or negative mood supports Ellis (1992); Blum-Kulka and House (1989).

In relation to the last strategies used in performing the request, it has to do with purposes of performing the request. As study reveals that the purposes of requests performed include *goods, services, attention, pedagogic activity, and action* as shown in lines (46)-(50). Such realization of the request with its given purposes corroborates with the study of Ellis (1992); Blum-Kulka & House (1989).

4. Conclusion

In relation to the classification of speech, act performed, there are 4 types of speech acts found: imperatives, assertive, expressions and commissives. There are eight subcategories of imperatives found including the *question, request, suggestion, hope, instructing, inviting, prohibit and order*. For assertive, There are eleven subcategories of assertions found in teacher-student interaction covering *informing, answer, assert, stating, assuming, concluding, categorizing, recount, accepting, agreeing*. Meanwhile, during teacher-students interaction, the expressive founds includes three subcategories, namely *greeting, thank and compliment*. The least type and subcategory found is commissives. There is only one subcategory found, *promising*. These classifications are based on the illocutionary forces and its components ranging from the *illocutionary point, the degree of strength of illocutionary point, mode of achievement, propositional content condition, preparatory condition, sincerity condition and degree of strength of sincerity condition*.

There are about 278 instances of speech acts performed in the interaction of teacher and students. The most dominant type of speech acts performed by teacher and student during interaction is imperatives. It is about 120 acts or 43%. Assertiveness performed are about 117 acts or 42%. It is categorized as dominant. Meanwhile, the acts of expressions are 34 or 12%. It is a less dominant category. Commissions are categorized as not dominant since it is about 7 or 2,5%.

As study concerns, it is also about how imperatives are realized in teacher and student interaction. The study recognizes that the realization of the request as strategies used in the realization of request covering: (a) formal completeness, (b) level of directness, (c) point of views, and (d) context and mood.

A study about speech acts performed in teacher-student interaction is needed to know the linguistic competence and pragmatic competence of students. This is very crucial not only in teaching English in ESL context but also in EFL context. In fact, many students are able to speak English accurately, but they fail to communicate appropriately due to the lack pragmatic competence.

Since this study is limited, it is needed to hold further study about student pragmatic competence in performing any subcategories of speech acts. Furthermore, it needs to conduct a study in the broader context in terms of population and samples in order to get much more information about the pragmatic competence of teacher and students, the strategies used in performing given speech acts.

Acknowledgments

The mercy and blessing belong to Allah The Almighty Who Has Been Given us the favor and still devote the love for us. And I don't forget to alter my best gratitude to the last messenger the noble Prophet Muhammad peace be upon him. I would like to express my special gratitude, the long-lasting gratefulness to my first consultant Drs. Priono, M.A., Ph.D. for his great advice during my study and writing this thesis, and my second consultant Dr. H. Nuriadi, SS., M.Hum for the valuable directions in writing this thesis. Without their endless support, none of this would be possible. They do not only give support but also guidance and great advise to finish this thesis. I also want to express my gratitude to the Head of English Graduate Department, Dr. Arifuddin, M.Pd, and all lectures of English Graduate Department. They have engaged courses and dedication to students. They keep on guiding and supporting to all of the English graduate students to read and write. Finally, I hope this writing would be useful for the English trainers as the sources and feedback to develop English as the global language and scientific field of knowledge.

References

- Alston, W. P. (2000). *Illocutionary acts and sentence meaning*. Cornell University Press.
- Asher, N., & Lascarides, A. (2001). Indirect speech acts. *Synthese*, 128(1-2), 183-228.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). 1962 How to do things with words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aydin, M. (2013). *Cross cultural Pragmatics: A study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey* (Doctoral dissertation, Minnesota State University, Mankato).
- Bach, K., & Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge, Mas&. ic.
- Barlow, J. A., Pruitt, S. L., & Keare, A. R. K. A. R. The phonotactics of “zero-s” The phonotactics of zero-s in AAE-speaking children: Word boundary effects.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: Length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 8(2), 165-179.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Vol. 31). Ablex Pub.
- Cedeño, M. L. D., Arteaga, M. G. D., Pérez, A. V., & Arteaga, M. L. D. (2017). Regulatory Framework for Renewable Energy Sources in Ecuador Case Study Province of Manabí. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 1(2), 29-42.
- Corder, S. P., & Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage* (Vol. 112). Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Dewi, I. G. A. A. O., & Dewi, I. G. A. A. P. (2017). Corporate Social Responsibility, Green Banking, and Going Concern on Banking Company in Indonesia Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 1(3), 118-134.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom: A study of two language learners' requests. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 14(1), 1-23.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language learning*, 34(1), 45-63.
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *The philosophical review*, 66(3), 377-388.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. *Perspectives on language in performance*, 2, 1250-1288.
- Iriani, D. H. (2018). The Effect of Early English Learning on Psychology. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 2(1), 65-74.
- Junaidi, M. (2016). illocutionary force, normative dimensions and moral teaching of illocutionary act of assertives: an exploratory study of sasak community. *the indonesian journal of language and language teaching*, 1(1), 16-16.
- Kazemi Zadeh Gol, N. (2013). *A Contrastive Study of the Speech Act of Refusal; Iranian ESL Learners and Native English Speaking Americans* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toledo).
- Kissine, M. (2013). *From utterances to speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lestari, S. H. P. (2016). students' communication strategies in learning speaking through exclusive learning model at the second grade of SMA N 1 Metro.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.
- Sadock, J. M. (1974). *Toward a linguistic theory of speech acts*. Academic Pr.
- Sbisà, M. (2001). Illocutionary force and degrees of strength in language use. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(12), 1791-1814.
- Sbisà, M. (2009). Uptake and conventionality in illocution. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 5(1), 33-52.
- Searle, J. R. (1968). Austin on locutionary and illocutionary acts. *The philosophical review*, 405-424.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.
- Searle, J. R. (1971). What is speech act?/The philosophy of language/Ed. by JR Searle.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). The logical status of fictional discourse. *Expression and meaning*, 58-75.
- Searle, J. R. (1985). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Siebel, M. (2003). Illocutionary acts and attitude expression. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 26(3), 351-366.
- Sinclair, J. M. (1992). Towards an analysis of discourse. *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*.
- Strawson, P. F. (1964). Intention and convention in speech acts. *The philosophical review*, 439-460.
- Suarta, I. M. (2017). Revitalization of Oral Literature Tradition of Balinese Society Based Character Values As Deradicalism Effort. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 1(3), 8-16.

- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in second language acquisition*, 15, 165-179.
- Syarifaturrahman, W. K., & Hanafi, N. (2017). The Inflection of Sasak Language in Kuripan Village. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (IJSSH)*, 1(3), 155-181.
- Tamara, C. W. (2015). *Directive Speech Act Realization In The Teaching And Learning at Magister Of Language Studies Muhammadiyah University Of Surakarta 2014* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).
- Vanderveken, D. (1990). *Meaning and speech acts: Volume 1, principles of language use* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfson, N. (1983). An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*, 82-95.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Biography of Authors

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <p>Ahmad Syaifudin Azhari was born in Lembuak Narmada on June 27, 1971. He completed his study of elementary education up to Senior School at his hometown and he got his bachelor of English at IKIP Mataram in 2002. Then he continued to The Master Degree of English Program in Mataram University. Now, he is a teacher in Nurul Haramain Boarding School Lembuak Narmada West Nusa Tenggara.</p> <p><i>Email: ahmadsyaifudinazhari@yahoo.co.id</i></p> |
|  | <p>Drs. H. Priyono, MA, Ph.D. was born in Surabaya on March 10, 1955. He completed the study of elementary education up to high school in his hometown. Furthermore, he continued his bachelor in English Language Education at IKIP Malang. He completed his study in 1981. In 1987, he completed his master's studies in the field of TESOL at the Michigan State University and he continued the doctoral program in Applied Linguistics at Macquarie University. He is a lecturer in Department of English Education and Postgraduate Program at Mataram University.</p> <p><i>Email: brospri@gmail.com</i></p> |
|  | <p>Nuriadi, S.S., M.Hum., was born in Sengkol, Central Lombok on September 23, 1976. He completed his study of the graduate program in English Literature at Gadjah Mada University Jogjakarta. He continued the study of master and doctoral program in American Studies at Gadjah Mada University. He is now a lecturer in English Departement Education and Postgraduate School at Mataram University. Additionally, he is now the Secretary of Indonesian Education and Postgraduate School at Mataram University.</p> <p><i>Email: nurex23@yahoo.com</i></p> |