



SPEECH ACTS PRODUCTION IN EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS (A CONVERSATION ANALYSIS)

Produksi Tindakan Bicara Dalam Interaksi Kelas EFL (Analisis Percakapan)

Hieronimus Canggung Darong

Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus

Jalan Ahmad Yani 10 Manggarai NTT Tenda, Nusa Tenggara Timur 86511

Pos-el: hieronimusdarong@gmail.com

Naskah Diterima Tanggal 5 Mei 2022 — Direvisi Akhir Tanggal 30 Oktober 2024 — Disetujui Tanggal 19 Desember 2024
doi: <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v13i2.4771>

Abstrak

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis jenis dan fungsi tindak tutur yang diucapkan oleh seorang guru Bahasa Inggris dan siswa dalam interaksi di kelas. Data hasil observasi dikumpulkan dan dianalisis sesuai dengan prinsip-prinsip analisis percakapan (CA). Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa jenis tindak tutur yang dihasilkan oleh guru dan siswa dipengaruhi oleh peran dan status masing-masing. Meskipun siswa menghasilkan lebih sedikit tindak tutur, mereka memiliki fungsi yang sama dengan tindak tutur guru dalam hal mengontrol dan mengelola interaksi di kelas. Dengan demikian, tindak tutur siswa dan guru mendistribusikan otoritas dengan cara yang berbeda selama pertukaran ide dan proposisi percakapan. Pengetahuan praktis dan aspek pedagogis hubungan guru-siswa sebagai peristiwa sosial yang unik memiliki potensi untuk mengelola interaksi kelas secara efektif.

Kata-kata kunci: otoritas, tindak tutur, intaraksi

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the speech act types and functions that were used by an EFL teacher and their students during classroom interactions. Observational data was collected and analyzed according to Conversation Analysis standards (CA). The findings of the study revealed that the types of speech acts produced by the teacher and students were influenced by their respective roles and statuses. Although the students produced fewer speech acts, they served the same functions as the teacher's speech acts in terms of controlling and managing classroom interactions. As a result, the speech acts of both the students and teacher distributed authority in different ways during turn-taking and commodity exchanges. The practical knowledge and pedagogical aspect of the teacher-student relationship as a unique social event in the classroom context has the potential to effectively manage classroom interactions.

Keywords: authority, speech act, interaction

How to Cite: Darong, Hieronimus Canggung. (2024). Speech Acts Production in EFL Classroom Interactions (A Conversation Analysis). *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*. 13(2). 354—367. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v13i2.4771>

INTRODUCTION

In language learning, progress reports have utilized pragmatics to investigate how to enable learners to generate English as a second or foreign language. These reports explore different research types and the findings illustrating how learners produce language. The study is focused on pragmatic language production, classroom interaction, teacher talks, questioning behavior, and other aspects of pragmatics.

Research on pragmatic-related issues in the context of EFL generally takes the form of interventional studies and observational studies (Martínez-Flor, 2013). Interventional studies aim to address deliberate interventions used in a classroom setting to teach students certain pragmatic aspects of the target language. They investigate whether specific pragmatic components can be taught effectively and whether the methods, approaches, and tactics used are successful in achieving this goal. Thus, the classroom is viewed as a space where students can acquire new information through carefully planned pedagogical activities that focus on pragmatics acquisition through language and action. Observational studies, on the other hand, involve the researcher investigating pragmatic concerns in a real classroom using the target language. The primary goal is to characterize any areas or features that may impact how the target language is acquired pragmatically.

Interventional studies have been conducted on pragmatic-related topics, focusing on the ability to teach various pragmatic aspects such as learning objectives, tasks, and instructional principles. These studies are closely related to specific instructional approaches, both implicit and explicit, which aim to promote pragmatic development in the classroom context (Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, & Su, 2017; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2015; Limberg, 2016; Naoko Taguchi, Xiao, & Li, 2016; Naoko Taguchi, 2012; Tajeddin & Moghadam, 2012; Tajeddin & Pezeshki, 2014). Other studies aim to assist students in developing a deep and conceptual understanding of various contexts using specific methodologies and guiding principles (Carassa & Colombetti, 2015; Cohen, 2015; Limberg, 2015, 2016; Nicholas, 2015; Siegel, 2016; Tromp, Hagoort, & Meyer, 2016; Youn, 2014).

Observational studies have also been a focus of researchers in the field. For example, previous research has found that the creation of speech acts is influenced by pragmatic input. Therefore, it is recommended that clear input be provided to facilitate effective language development (Meihami & Khanlarzadeh, 2015; Thi, Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2015). Other studies have highlighted the role of factors such as L1, status, social distance, power, and rank as dynamic and complex processes that affect learners' creation of speech acts (Eshghinejad & Moini, 2016; Holmes, 2000; Ren & Gao, 2012; Naoko Taguchi, 2012, 2018; Wijayanto, Prasetyarini, & Hikmat, 2017; Zhu, 2012). Therefore, teachers need to be aware of the input and methods that can assist learners in their language production.

Studies have also examined teachers' pragmatic strategies in classroom interactions, revealing the importance of not only the content of their speech acts, but also how they convey messages to language learners during activities (Darong, 2020; Darong et al., 2021; Eshghinejad & Moini, 2016; Lin, 2015; Ren & Gao, 2012; Saleem et al., 2021; Tromp et al., 2016; Wijayanto et al., 2017). However, these studies have neglected to explore the types and functions of speech acts that teachers employ to control classroom discourse. Classrooms are not only places of language learning, but also arenas where teachers and students engage in speech acts and information exchanges crucial for achieving learning objectives. As a result, this study aims to expand on previous research by examining the type and function of speech acts used by both teachers and students in their classroom interactions, recognizing the classroom as a unique social event with its customs, rituals, and norms.

Classroom interaction is a social event, and the classroom can be seen as a mini-society with its own customs, rituals, and norms. Understanding the practical knowledge and

pedagogical use of the teacher-student relationship as a unique social event within the classroom context can be advantageous for fostering better classroom interactions.

THEORETICAL BASIS

Speech Act

Austin introduced the term "speech act" in 1962, which was later refined by Searle in 1969. According to Austin, speech acts are any language expression that serves a performative purpose, such as inviting, celebrating, warning, provoking, ordaining, and so forth. The type of speech act used depends on the context and is classified into three categories: locutionary, which deals with the literal meaning; illocutionary, which deals with the intended meaning; and perlocutionary, which deals with the actual consequence or effect (Yazdanfar & Bonyadi, 2016).

Following the Austin theory, Searle (1969) categorized illocutionary acts into five types: assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. Later, this classification was expanded to six by adding the question category. Clark eventually created seven categories from these six, which include assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, effective, verdictive, and quotation. Regardless of the number and types of categories determined by various scholars, each category has a unique communicative purpose that works together with a specific context. In contrast, Bach & Harnish (1979) categorized speech acts into constative, directive, commissive, and acknowledgments.

Based on their functions, Bach and Harnish (1979) classified speech acts, and each type serves different purposes. The constative type includes functions such as assertive, predictive, retrodictive, descriptive, ascriptive, informative, confirmative, concessive, retractive, assentive, dissentive, disputive, responsive, suggestive, and supportive. Directive, on the other hand, serves six functions, including requestive, questions, requirements, prohibitive, permissive, and advisories. Commissive, meanwhile, serves only two functions, namely stating promises and offering (volunteer/bid). Finally, acknowledgment has eight functions, including apologizing, condoling, congratulating, greeting, thanking, bidding, accepting, and rejecting. In the educational context, Edmonson-House in Trosborg (1994) proposed another type of speech act called didactic, which has instructional functions that benefit both teachers and students in the teaching-learning process. These functions include control and organizational function, motivational function, and evaluative function (Johnson, 1997; Coulthard, 1983). These functions can be observed in the context and discourse moves that occur in classroom interactions.

Speech acts are concerned with language structures that combine both reality and meaning. To express oneself in various ways, like giving orders, making statements, or asking questions, one must not only observe the world but also interact with those around them (Carr, Schrock, & Dauterman, 2012). To comprehend speech act theory, one must not only have linguistic proficiency but also understand the meaning behind the words and how speakers interact with each other to express meaning using syntactic patterns (Christison, 2018).

Language teachers might encounter difficulties when trying to understand speech acts. Cohen (2015) suggests that the inability to analyze speech acts in isolated pairs might arise from the lack of integration into a larger conversation where speech acts are expressed over several turns. Oversimplification of speech acts is the notion that speech acts can be understood as a single utterance or in pairs. Therefore, speech acts should be comprehended in the context of the whole conversation. To achieve this level of understanding, Nicholas (2015) asserts that language learners must fully grasp speech acts as they appear in genuine conversations, such as those that occur in classroom interactions.

Understanding speech acts is crucial for the development of other pragmatic features such as politeness, as stated by Naoko Taguchi et al. (2016), Tajeddin & Pezeshki (2014), and Wijayanto et al. (2017). These scholars argue that social distance between speakers, status levels, and speech acts can affect the frequency and use of politeness strategies. Moreover, successful comprehension of speech acts depends on learners' ability to interpret the cultural and linguistic context of the target language, as argued by Ren & Gao (2012), Saleem, Anjum, & Tahir (2021), Naoko Taguchi (2018), and Tamimi Sa'd & Mohammadi (2014). Failure to do so may result in negative pragmatic transfer. To avoid this, learners must not only develop metapragmatic awareness and pragmatic skills but also be made aware of the potential pragmatic consequences of their language choices, as suggested by Economidou-kogetsidis (2015) and Siegel (2015, 2016).

Apart from other factors, pragmatic motivation, input, and learners' approach have a significant impact on the development of speech acts. Tajeddin and Moghadam (2012) have demonstrated that motivation plays a crucial role in increasing L2 pragmatic production. Additionally, other researchers, such as Limberg (2016), Meihami and Khanlarzadeh (2015), Thi et al. (2015), and Thuy, Nguyen, Hanh, and Tam (2012), acknowledge the importance of input in assisting students with the production of speech acts. Furthermore, some studies suggest that learners' strategies, such as in requests and apologies, may also affect their production of speech acts. These strategies are linked to both pragmalinguistic proficiency and socio-pragmatic competency, as addressed by Tromp et al. (2016), Yazdanfar and Bonyadi (2016), and Zhu (2012). Limberg (2015) also claims that socio-pragmatic competencies work together to enhance the development of speech acts.

Furthermore, the method, approach, and tactic of teaching and learning activities have an influence on the production of speech acts. These factors can assist students in comprehending both the content and form of their utterances. An effective teaching strategy and methodology promote the enhancement of students' pragmatic abilities, resulting in language production and input exposure during interaction (Cohen, 2015; Couper & Watkins, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2020; Naoko Taguchi, 2018).

Although the previous studies provide positive outcomes, there is still a need for further research in this area. According to these studies, speech acts are influenced by various factors including input from teachers and students, as well as motivation, approach, and strategy. These studies mainly focus on how students produce language in the classroom. However, the specific types and functions of speech acts in the actual dialogues of classroom interactions have not been thoroughly investigated.

Teachers and students can both benefit from studying speech acts, as it can provide teachers with knowledge about the different types and functions of speech acts that either improve or detract from classroom interactions. In order to build a better understanding of the complex relationships and learning opportunities within the classroom, it is important to know how to properly use speech acts and assign appropriate functions (Canh & Renandya, 2017; Claessens et al., 2016). When learners are able to produce language and actions in response to teacher inquiries or other inputs, they are motivated to address both macro and micro linguistic aspects. Additionally, studying speech acts can provide solutions to difficult scenarios that teachers may encounter in the classroom. This can lead to more frequent dialogic teaching and meaning negotiation, resulting in mutual understanding between teachers and students in terms of information sharing and language development.

Conversation Analysis

Before conducting an analysis, it is important to consider the methods used to analyze oral discourse in classroom settings. In other words, it is necessary to examine alternative

ways of interpreting instructor speech acts in classroom interactions. Interaction Analysis (IA), Discourse Analysis (DA), and Conversation Analysis are three widely used methodologies in Classroom Discourse Analysis (CA).

Interaction Analysis (IA) focuses on various procedures used to evaluate and explain how students and teachers behave in the classroom, with an emphasis on verbal and nonverbal communication patterns and social correlations that occur in the classroom (Richards & Schmid, 1992). It examines the interactions that take place between students and teachers. On the other hand, Discourse Analysis (DA) deals with spoken and written linguistics and tends to ignore the discourse process, which includes participants like teachers and students. DA is concerned with the linguistic aspects of the speaker as the product of written and oral communication modes (Brown & Yule, 1983). The first two methods allow predetermined structural-functional categories of data that are prescribed or imposed. In contrast, Conversation Analysis describes how meanings and pragmatic purposes are communicated during interactions and examines the structure of speech and the order of taking turns.

For this study, the third methodology, Conversation Analysis (CA), was chosen as the framework for analyzing the data. In the context of a classroom, using CA to demonstrate how meaning is co-constructed, negotiated, and shared by both learners and teachers could be useful. The purpose of applying CA in this study was to examine the utterances of both teachers and students and to enhance the negotiation of meaning during interactions. Unlike Discourse Analysis, which is primarily concerned with the speaker, and Interaction Analysis, which focuses on both verbal and nonverbal communication in the classroom, CA regards the utterances as a collaborative effort between teachers and students, making it the primary focus of the investigation. To reveal how interaction is structured, CA employs detailed transcripts of audio or video recordings.

To use Conversation Analysis in a study, it is necessary to use naturally occurring language samples rather than artificially created ones. The style of language being analyzed also differs, as Conversation Analysis focuses on oral discourse in turn-taking and exchange systems, whereas Discourse Analysis examines both written and oral language, and Interaction Analysis evaluates both verbal and nonverbal cues. These differences are relevant to the topic of the study, which focuses on speech acts used by teachers in their interactions with students, and thus support the use of Conversation Analysis (Marie & Rohan, 2011).

It is essential to stress the four core principles of CA that researchers need to adhere to. The first principle states that all interactions, including turn-taking, are orderly. This means that CA allows researchers to observe interactions as a whole, rather than focusing on just one participant. Both the speaker and the listener co-create the interactions. The second principle pertains to the design of turns. It suggests that each participant's contribution to the exchanges is context-dependent and context-renewing. Each turn in the interaction has a significant impact on the conversation and shapes the turns that follow. The third principle focuses on social action. It posits that individuals use their utterances at different times to accomplish an action, rather than just speaking or using the utterance as it is. Therefore, every action has a specific goal or intention that is evident in the conversation's order in which the exchange occurs. The final principle concerns the bottom-up, data-based analysis approach. It highlights that CA is employed because it can identify genuine interactions without assuming the interactions' socio-cultural environment beforehand. These principles are essential to follow when using CA to analyze interactions in a classroom setting (Ghafarpour, 2016; Ingram & Elliott, 2015; Lam, 2018; Marie & Rohan, 2011).

Furthermore, applying CA principles to data analysis allows for the examination of the types and pragmatic functions of teachers' speech acts based on observations made during interactions. This study acknowledges that the classroom setting is dynamic and frequently

influenced by turn-taking sequences used by both teachers and students. CA is used to analyze speech acts that affect how information is organized, and the implicit functions that align with the social action principle of CA are indisputable. A speech act can have more than one type of function, and understanding the meaning based solely on verbal forms is insufficient. According to CA, interactions in which turn-taking occurs must be governed by conventions and regulations. Therefore, a teacher's speech act should not be viewed as a single utterance. Rather, it is shaped and renewed by the context, resulting from a previous move occurring in the turn-taking order or sequence of talk within the interactions that undoubtedly adhere to the CA principles.

For successful interactions between teachers and students, it is crucial for both parties to observe and predict each other's behavior. The ability to predict behavior is possible because of norms and regulations, which are emphasized by the CA principle of turn-taking design that takes context into account. The discourse move principle, which evaluates the types and functions of a teacher's speech acts, is realized through the order of sequence of talk or the turn-taking system that occurs during interactions. Conversation Analysis (CA) principles recognize this arrangement as a result of the meanings and social behaviors of the teacher and students involved in the conversations.

It is worth noting that CA views the classroom context as dynamic and co-created by the teacher and students as participants, reinforced by the multiple linguistic and educational goals present in the classroom. In this context, the data are allowed to speak for themselves, accurately depicting the interactions between teachers and students, and showcasing the teachers' speech acts in the interaction structure (Cancino, 2015).

RESEARCH METHOD

The research project requires the use of a descriptive qualitative approach to investigate the speech acts of teachers in classroom interactions. As classroom communication is the focus, potential participants are likely to be teachers and students in English language classes. Consequently, the study's context was an EFL class at the college level.

The speech act types in this study adhered to the classification proposed by Bach and Harnish (1979) and Edmonson-House (Trosborg, 1994). The speech act instructional functions were taken from Johnson (1997) and Coulthard (1983) due to their practical application in classroom interaction analysis. Since Conversation Analysis (CA) was used to analyze the corpus in this study, there was no level, skill, or even content structure for the observed classes. As such, it is used to analyze the actual interactions without presuming the applicability of the sociocultural framework in which the interactions take place.

The subject of the study was a sixty-two-year-old professor with twenty-six years of teaching experience, chosen because the research aimed to investigate how oral expression interactions are handled. After obtaining permission from the faculty board and reviewing his academic profiles, he was deemed an appropriate participant due to his exposure to and proficiency in the English language.

The main method used by the researcher to understand teachers' speech acts in classroom interactions was through passive observation, which is a type of non-intrusive observation. The researcher was present in the classroom only for observation purposes and did not interact with the teacher or students. Taking notes during observation was essential, but audio recordings were necessary to verify the accuracy of the observational data.

The observed class was transcribed using the conversation analysis convention, based mainly on Jefferson (Hosoda, 2015), which considers the dominant IRE/F interaction pattern in the classroom. The transcript was carefully reviewed, and specific episodes were selected based on how well they contributed to the study's goal of examining the types and functions

of teacher and student speech acts. An episode refers to a series of sequences that, taken individually and together, help accomplish a task or activity goal. Each episode involving teacher and student speech acts was examined in detail.

To counteract any potential biases in the study, the researcher employed verification procedures such as triangulation and member checking. The data were thoroughly compared and cross-checked during the analysis process. The findings obtained from these verification techniques were considered in the final analysis.

DISCUSSION

Speech Act Types

The speech acts that were used during the teaching-learning process are shown in the Table 1 and Table 2. The data on the types and functions were delivered in turn.

Table 1.
Speech Act Types

No	Illocutionary acts Types	Performers	
		Students	Teachers
I	<i>Constatives</i>		
	<i>Object/Protest</i>	4	-
	<i>Praise</i>	-	32
	<i>Answer/Reply</i>	98	4
	<i>Deny</i>	4	-
	<i>Describe</i>	-	54
	<i>Inform/tell</i>	-	15
II	<i>State</i>	-	119
	<i>Directives</i>		
	<i>Insist</i>	-	47
	<i>ask</i>	4	115
	<i>Summon/call</i>	3	-
	<i>urge</i>	-	4
	<i>warn</i>	-	2
	<i>advise</i>	-	3
	<i>forbid</i>	-	6
	<i>suggest</i>	-	6
III	<i>Command/instruct</i>	-	58
	<i>Commissives</i>		
	<i>promise</i>	-	3
IV	<i>Volunteer/bid</i>	5	-
	<i>Acknowledgement</i>		
V	<i>thank</i>	2	-
	<i>greet</i>	2	-
V	<i>Didactives</i>		
	<i>correct</i>	1	3
	<i>Evaluate/repeat</i>	2	47

Table 2.
Function of Speech Acts

Speech Acts	Types	function	
		General	Instructional
	<i>Constatives</i>	1. <i>Assertives</i> 2. <i>Informatives</i> 3. <i>descriptives</i>	1. <i>Control and organizational</i> 2. <i>Motivational</i> 3. <i>Evaluative</i>
	<i>Directives</i>	1. <i>Requirements</i> 2. <i>Prohibitives</i> 3. <i>Requestives</i> 4. <i>advisories</i>	<i>Control and organizational</i>
	<i>Commissive</i>	1. <i>Promises</i>	1. <i>Control and organizational</i>

Speech Acts	Types	function	
		General	Instructional
Teacher's	Acknowledgement	2. Offers	2. Motivational
		1. Greet	1. Control and organizational
		2. Thank	2. Motivational
	3. accept	3. evaluative	
	Didacticives	1. Disputives	1. motivational
2. Descriptives		2. Evaluative	
Students'	Constatives	3. informatives	3. Control and organizational
		Responsive	Control and organizational
	Directives	Requestive	Control and organizational
	Commissive	Offer	Motivational
	Acknowledgment	promise	
Greet		Control and organizational	
		Thank	
	Didacticives	Confirmatives	Evaluative

Conversation Analysis

The focus of this study is on identifying the different types of speech acts produced by teachers and students in classroom interactions, and their corresponding functions. Based on the data presented in Table 1, it is evident that the teacher is the dominant speaker during these interactions, having produced 518 speech acts compared to the students' 125. These speech acts are used to facilitate the teaching-learning process through various discourse moves, with the teacher's constative speech acts serving to express beliefs and intentions that align with the learning objectives.

The teacher's use of constative speech acts demonstrates a belief while also expressing an intention that the hearer forms (or maintains) a similar belief (Bach and Harnish (1979). The teacher in this study is more influential and has a social role in relation to the learning objectives. As a result, stating, praising, informing, responding to, or describing the lesson is common to occur. Additionally, these forms in question performed general functions namely assertive, informative, and descriptive as a result of discourse movements that took place in the class (Table 2). While the majority of the constative speech acts that students generate have a responsive function because they respond to or answer the teacher's queries when the teaching-learning process is in progress (Yes, Sir, we will; Absolutely yes).

T: Today is a speaking class

We try to speak English, OK?

S: Yes, Sir, we will

T :Before we start, I'd like to ask you a question. Have you ever heard thr snow white story?

S: Absolutely yes.

T: Others?

Well, once upon a time there was a young beautiful lady lived in a village

Adding to the instructional function, the constative function has control and organizing, motivating, and evaluative roles in both teacher and student utterances. These duties are strongly tied to the teacher's role in structuring and regulating classroom conversation. It is control and organizational behavior to express or to say (assertively) something in teaching-learning activities, such as learning objectives or explanations (today is a speaking class; we strive to talk). In the meantime, the motivating function is concerned when the instructor, for instance, makes announcements, informs something, commands students, or instructs the

students to do something (before we begin, let me ask you a question) (informative). The teacher's description of something, questions, and comments serve as an example of the evaluative function. (Have you ever heard the Snow White story?: Once upon a time,...).

When compared to student-produced directives, teacher-produced directives are much more effective. The teacher appears to be an unavoidable authority figure who controls everything in the classroom because he uses commands to assert his authority and existence. This is because the teacher wants the students to accomplish something, which is referred to as the psychological condition of "wants" (Schiffirin, 1994). The teacher makes an effort to elicit verbal and nonverbal commitments from the pupils for some imminent future course of action. In this study, the teacher's directive speech act typically serves the following purposes: a request (requestive) (could you please), an advising (advisory) (next time, a little faster), a prohibition (prohibitive) (not other pages), and a demand (requirement) (Now, move to page five; Take a look at that page). Differently, students' speech act represents the requestive function. Students responded to the teacher's order by asking, "What about page four?" as is illustrated in the following excerpt:

T: Yeah, now move to page five
eah, now move to page five
S: What about page four?
T: Take a look at that page. No other pages!
T: Well, page five Hello? Page five! Could you, please? Next time, a little bit faster
S: (being silent and opening their books)

The teacher and students utilized directing speech acts to regulate and organize the classroom discourse in terms of instructional function. It has been suggested that the classroom behavior standards are so well-defined that students interpret every teacher utterance as a potential order, and thus follow a broad rule of "scanning" for directed intent. Generally, the imperative or directions are given to subordinates or to those who know each other well, in this case, the teacher and students. Consequently, the teacher's use of directions implies their superiority over the students, who are subordinate to orders and commands. The power dynamics and social distance are factors that influence the form of instructions and the structuring of classroom discourse, as evidenced by studies conducted by Eshghinejad & Moini (2016), Manik & Hutagaol (2015), Tamimi Sa'd & Mohammadi (2014), and Yazdanfar & Bonyadi (2016).

The same as the production of acknowledgments, the production of commissives is in the students' "favor." According to the data in Table 1, the commissives and recognition are exclusively for the students. In terms of commissives, students' speech acts were concerned with a voluntary offer to provide a service or make a bid, which contributed to the conversation in the classroom. As the teacher got no response from the students he asked for, another student replied (S2 replaced S1 in answering teacher's question). Whereas, teacher's speech commissive speech acts served functions as a promise for the students (A score for you) as shown in the extract below. In this respect, commissive speech acts from the teacher and pupils served an instructionally motivating purpose. The student who responded to the question and the teacher inadvertently encouraged other pupils to respond to all teacher's questions during the teaching-learning process by saying, "A score for you."

T : Answer my question please! OK. You, please! What is the message of the story?
S1 : Silent
S2 : It is about caring and loving each other
T : Good. A score for you.
S : Thank you

Additionally, students' acknowledgment speech acts covered the usual greeting and thank-you behaviors as found in the student's reactions to the teacher's admiration. These occurred at the start, whilst, and end of class. As a result, it was merely a routine task with little bearing on classroom instructional moves.

The last type of speech act identified in this study is referred to as didactic, which is exclusively used in educational environments. The teacher in the classroom mostly employs didactic speech acts such as correcting, repeating, and evaluating. The teacher's use of these speech acts serves a variety of functions, including disputative, descriptive, and educational purposes. When the teacher questioned the students' answers (What do you mean? Which do you mean, A or B?) it serves disputative function. The utterance of constative was employed in descriptive function to classify, describe, and identify the expression of offering help (Tell him why you chose A). Meanwhile, the informative function served to counsel, inform, tell, or otherwise draw students' attention to anything (Brilliant. Very brilliant). Differently, students' didactic speech act dealt with confirmative function. It was utilized to confirm that the original statement was untrue, and it is confirmed (Tony Sir).

T: What do you mean? Do you mean A or B?

S1 : A

T: Good

T: Then, What else? Common, what else?

S: C

T: I don't think so

S2 : A

T: Good. Brilliant. Very brilliant Ricky. Tell him why you chose A.

S: Tony Sir

T: Sorry, Tony please do that!

In terms of the educational function, the teacher's didactic speech acts govern and organize the conversation in the classroom. The teacher was in charge of managing the commodity exchanges and interaction patterns. Unlikely, the primary focus of students' didactic speech acts was evaluative function. In this case, the student corrected the teacher since he had the student's name in the wrong place.

The results of this study suggest that the interpretation of speech acts must be contextualized within the entire conversation sequence. Context and word choice can be flexible, as evidenced by language input that precedes or follows certain statements, which supports the findings of earlier studies (Economidou-kogetsidis, 2015; Limberg, 2015; Martínez-flor, 2013; Ren & Gao, 2012; Tajeddin & Pezeshki, 2014). Therefore, both teachers and students must be aware of the pragmatic meaning of their language use in relation to the context.

The teacher has the responsibility to choose a subject, break it down into smaller pieces, and prevent digressions and misunderstandings in the classroom. Coulthard (1983) suggested that there are different types of organization and structure in every interaction, and a teacher can approach a lesson from a pedagogical perspective to create a pedagogical structure that shows the steps of the lesson. According to Sinclair et al. (cited in Coulthard, 1983), a lesson has both linguistic and pedagogical structures, and transactions have a structure that is expressed in terms of change.

It is important to recognize that the didactic aspect is a crucial objective of educational communication. Teachers are granted extensive communicative authority because of their expertise and their responsibility to fulfill the objectives of the course (Trosborg, 1994).

According to Trosborg, given the teacher's social function in the classroom, they have the right to regulate and guide interactions and provide feedback to students on their performance.

Contrary to prior research suggesting that teachers are the sole controllers and managers of classroom activities (Babaii, Parsazadeh, & Moradi, 2018; Sundh, 2017), the current study indicates that students can also act as controllers, managers, and even evaluators. This is supported by certain types of speech acts used to structure and organize classroom discourse. Although it may not be as apparent, this fosters classroom dialogue and promotes patterns of interaction.

In the classroom, active participation and awareness of the nature and purposes of interaction are essential for effective communication. Both teachers and students have responsibilities that, when carried out appropriately, can improve classroom interaction. Successful teaching and learning of a second or foreign language also requires complete engagement in the discourse construction of the language classroom. Conversation analysis suggests that involvement in this context refers to the natural and pragmatic management, use, and production of speech acts and their functions. This study employed conversation analysis to examine naturally occurring language instead of analyzing artificial language, by examining the types and functions of speech acts in their original, authentic settings.

CLOSING

Teaching using Speech Act theory is both feasible and encouraged. The purpose of speech acts in communication depends on their type and context. Speech act types have educational functions, including organizational, motivational, and evaluative functions, which they bring to classroom interactions. As a result, the teacher's role is crucial in establishing a natural EFL classroom environment that facilitates these functions. Furthermore, this study revealed that students can also contribute to achieving speech act functions. Despite their inferior status, they can position themselves as teachers, managers, and controllers by monitoring interactions and speech in the classroom. It is important to note that speech acts made by teachers and students are shaped by context and influenced by preceding actions in turn-taking order or a sequence of talks that follow conversation analysis principles.

However, this study has several limitations. Firstly, only one subject was used in the investigation, and future studies with more participants may provide richer data on speech act productions in classroom interactions. Secondly, since this study was merely observational, conducting interventional research on speech acts in future studies may be more interesting. Additionally, this study's focus on type and function is insufficient to address pragmatic-related features of speech acts. There is a high demand for other topics such as the interventional teaching of speech acts in educational settings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Babaii, E., Parsazadeh, A., & Moradi, H. (2018). The Question of Power in Language Classes from a Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective Once a student, always a student? *Pragmatics and Society*, 8(4), 542–570. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.8.4.04bab>
- Bardovi-harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Su, Y. (2017). The Effect of Corpus-based Instruction on Pragmatic Routines. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(3), 76–103.
- Cancino, M. (2015). Assessing Learning Opportunities in EFL Classroom Interaction : What Can Conversation Analysis Tell Us?. *RELC Journal*, 46(2), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214568109>

- Canh, L. Van, & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use: A Conversation Analysis Study. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690935>
- Carassa, A., & Colombetti, M. (2015). Interpersonal Communication as Social Action. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 45(4–5), 407–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393115580265>
- Carr, C. T., Schrock, D. B., & Dauterman, P. (2012). Speech Acts within Facebook Status Messages. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 31(2), 176–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X12438535>
- Christison, M. (2018). Speech Act Theory and Teaching Speaking. The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0712>
- Claessens, L. C. A., Tartwijk, J. Van, Want, A. C. Van Der, Helena, J. M., Verloop, N., Brok, P. J. Den, ... Wubbels, T. (2016). Positive Teacher-student Relationships Go beyond the Classroom, Problematic Ones Stay Inside. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 110(5), 478–493. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1129595>
- Cohen, A. D. (2015). Teaching Pragmatics in the Foreign Language Classroom: Grammar as a Communicative Resource, (July). <https://doi.org/10.2307/41756418>
- Couper, G., & Watkins, A. (2016). Teaching the Sociocultural Norms of an Undergraduate Community of Practice. *Tesol Journal*, 7(1), 4–39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.187>
- Darong, H. C. (2020). Pragmatic Strategy of Indonesian English Teachers in Questioning. *JELTL (Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics)*, 5(2), 145–162. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v5i2.398>
- Darong, H. C. (2021). Interpersonal Function of Joe Biden's Victory Speech (Systemic Functional Linguistics View). *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation Volume*, 5(1), 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v5i1.31420>
- Economidou-kogetsidis, M. (2015). Teaching Email Politeness in the EFL / ESL Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 415–424. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv031>
- Eshghinejad, S., & Moini, M. R. (2016). Politeness Strategies Used in Text Messaging: Pragmatic Competence in an Asymmetrical Power Relation of Teacher – Student, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016632288>
- Ghafarpour, H. (2016). Classroom Conversation Analysis and Critical Reflective Practice: Self-evaluation of Teacher Talk Framework in Focus. *RELC Journal*, 48(2), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216631173>
- Holmes, J. (2000). Politeness, power and provocation: how humor functions in the workplace. *Discourse Studies*, 2(2), 159–185. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1177/1461445600002002002>
- Hosoda, Y. (2015). Teacher Deployment of 'oh' in Known-answer Question Sequences. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(1), 58–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2015.1099111>
- Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2015). A Critical Analysis of the Role of Wait Time in Classroom Interactions and the Effects on Student and Teacher Interactional Behaviours. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(1), 37–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009365>
- Lam, D. M. K. (2018). What Counts as “Responding”? Contingency on Previous Speaker Contribution as a Feature of Interactional Competence. *Language Testing*, 35(3), 377–401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218758126>
- Limberg, H. (2015). Principles for Pragmatics Teaching: Apologies in the EFL Classroom. *ELT Journal Volume*, 69(3), 275–285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv012>

- Limberg, H. (2016). Teaching How to Apologize : EFL Textbooks and Pragmatic Input. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(6), 700–718. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815590695>
- Lin, C. (2015). An Exploratory Comparison of the Use of Modifiers by Native Speakers of English and Mandarin Chinese in Academic Lectures. *Text&Talk*, 35(1), 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2014-0027>
- Manik, S., & Hutagaol, J. (2015). An Analysis on Teachers ' Politeness Strategy and Student ' s Compliance in Teaching Learning Process at SD Negeri 024184 Binjai Timur Binjai North Sumatra-Indonesia. *English Language Teaching*, 8(8), 152–170. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n8p152>
- Martínez-flor, A. (2013). Classroom Research on Pragmatics. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0133>
- Meihami, H., & Khanlarzadeh, M. (2015). Pragmatic Content in Global and Local ELT Textbooks : A Micro Analysis Study. *SAGE Open*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015615168>
- Nguyen, D., Liakata, M., Dedeo, S., Eisenstein, J., Mimno, D., Tromble, R., & Winters, J. (2020). How We Do Things With Words: Analyzing Text as Social and Cultural Data. *Review*, 3(August), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2020.00062>
- Nicholas, A. (2015). A Concept-based Approach to Teaching Speech Acts in the EFL Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv034>
- Ren, J., & Gao, X. (2012). Negative Pragmatic Transfer in Chinese Students' Complimentary Speech Acts. *Psychological Reports*, 110(1), 149–165. <https://doi.org/10.2466/07.17.21.28.PR0.110.1.149-165>
- Saleem, T., Anjum, U., & Tahir, S. (2021). The Sociopragmatic and Pragmalinguistic Strategies in L2 Pragmatic Competence : A Case of Pakistani ESL Learners. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 50(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1877176>
- Siegel, J. (2015). Using Speech Act Sets to Inform Study Abroad Instruction. *The Language Teacher*, 39(6), 3–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.37546/JALTTLT39.6-1>
- Siegel, J. (2016). Pragmatic Activities for the Speaking Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 1–8.
- Sundh, L. (2017). The function of Teacher Questions in EFL Classroom Activities in Cambodia: A conversation Analytic Study. Department of English Individual Research Project (EN04GY), 1–32.
- Taguchi, N. (2012). The Effects of Practice Modality on Pragmatic Development in L2 Chinese. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12123.x>
- Taguchi, N. (2018). Description and Explanation of Pragmatic Development : Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods Research. System, in Press, 1–10.
- Taguchi, N., Xiao, F., & Li, S. (2016). Effects of Intercultural Competence and Social Contact on Speech Act Production in a Chinese Study Abroad Context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(4), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12349>
- Tajeddin, Z. (2012). Interlanguage Pragmatic Motivation : Its Construct and Impact on Speech Act Production. *RELC Journal*, 43(3), 353–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212468481>
- Tajeddin, Z., & Moghadam, A. Z. (2012). Interlanguage Pragmatic Motivation : Its Construct and Impact on Speech Act Production. *RELC Journal*, 43(3), 353–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212468481>

- Tajeddin, Z., & Pezeshki, M. (2014). Acquisition of Politeness Markers in an EFL Context : Impact of Input Enhancement and Output Tasks. *RELC Journal*, 45(3), 269–286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214555357>
- Tamimi Sa'd, S., & Mohammadi, M. (2014). A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners' polite and impolite apologies Seyyed. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 119–136.
- Thi, M., Nguyen, T., Pham, H. T., & Pham, T. M. (2015). The Effects of Input Enhancement and Recasts on the Development of Second Language Pragmatic Competence. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, (April 2015), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1026907>
- Thuy, T., Nguyen, M., Hanh, T., & Tam, M. (2012). The Relative Effects of Explicit and Implicit Form-focused Instruction on the Development of L2 Pragmatic Competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(4), 416–434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.003>
- Tromp, J., Hagoort, P., & Meyer, A. S. (2016). Pupillometry reveals Increased Pupil Size during Indirect Request Comprehension. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 69(6), 1093–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2015.1065282>
- Wijayanto, A., Prasetyarini, A., & Hikmat, M. H. (2017). Impoliteness in EFL : Foreign Language Learners ' Complaining Behaviors Across Social Distance and Status Levels. *SAGE Open*, (July-September), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017732816>
- Yazdanfar, S., & Bonyadi, A. (2016). Request Strategies in Everyday Interactions of Persian and English Speakers. *SAGE Open*, (October-December), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016679473>
- Youn, S. J. (2014). Validity Argument for Assessing L2 Pragmatics in Interaction Using Mixed Methods. *Language Testing*, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214557113>
- Zhu, W. (2012). Polite Requestive Strategies in Emails : An Investigation of Pragmatic Competence of Chinese EFL Learners. *RELC Journal*, 43(2), 217–238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212449936>