A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS ON THE SPEECH ACTS USED BY THREE ENGLISH TEACHERS OF SMP, SMA, AND SMK DURING ONLINE TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESS

Nur Shafiera
1710117320036@mhs.ulm.ac.id
Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

Fatchul Mu'in
Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

Nanik Mariani
Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

Noor Eka Chandra
Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the speech acts used by three English teachers of SMPIT Nurul Ikhwan Nagan Raya, SMA Tunas Luhur, and SMKN 2 Payakumbuh during online teaching and learning process. This research was descriptive-qualitative. The data were the subjects' utterances obtained by observations on six online learning videos from YouTube. It was transcribed into the written form, selected to fit the study's objective, recorded into the datasheets, interpreted, and analyzed using speech acts theory. The practice of triangulation was used by asking the expert to check data validity. The result showed that declarative locutionary act was mainly used in representatives to utter some explanations of the materials. Directive and representative illocutionary acts were dominantly used. Questioning act of directive used mostly to allow the students to be active and check their comprehension. Explaining and informing of representative were used frequently to transfer the materials and tell certain facts to the students. Perlocutionary act student(s): learn something and do something were primarily occurred. Student(s): learn something mainly occurred when performed explaining and informing of representative resulted to students knew/understood the given explanations and information. Perlocutionary act student(s): do something mainly occurred when questioning and commanding of directive resulted in students giving the answers and doing as commanded. The subjects' ways in expressing speech acts were quite different since having different background and culture. They used Bahasa Indonesia than English in

performing speech acts. It is suggested that the teachers should use English more than Bahasa Indonesia when teaching English.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Speech Act, Utterance, Teacher, Online Teaching and Learning, Online Classroom Interaction, Online Learning Video

INTRODUCTION

In everyday life, people cannot be separated from communicating with each other. People communicate using words to express their thoughts, feelings and to give others information. Richard & Schmidth (2003: 97) stated that in the act of communication, there is typically at least one speaker, a communication message that is delivered, and an individual or individuals for whom the hearer means this message. In communicating with others, the most important thing is language. Without language, communication cannot be done because it plays a vital role through communication. It is based on Mu'in, Dini, & Rosyi (2018: 3), who stated, "the existence of language for the community is very important because men as social beings always live in community and need a language as a means of interaction with others."

Yule (1996: 4) clarified that the analysis of the relationship between the linguistic form and the user of that form is called pragmatics. It implies that from some utterances, the association is to know the form and the objectives of those utterances. Pragmatics is also to understand the meanings, aims or goals, and sorts of actions of people's utterances. Meanwhile, Mey (1993) claimed that the study of language, which is defined by social meaning, is called pragmatics Mariani & Mu'in (2007: 133) stated that there are some dimensions of pragmatics; one of them is speech acts. Yule (2010: 133) defined a speech act as the action carried out by a speaker with an utterance. Meanwhile, Mey (2001: 93) claimed, "the speech act is the basic unit of communication." Three dimensions consist of speech acts: locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act.

Yule (1996: 48) stated that a locutionary act is the basic act of utterance or creating a coherent linguistic expression. It refers specifically to the speaker's actual words. There are three types of locutionary acts that can be used to construct English sentences. If it tells something, it is declarative; if it gives an order, it is imperative; and if it asks a question, it is interrogative. According to Levinson (1983), all languages tend to have at least two, if not more, of these sentence types. For instance, "*I've just made some coffee,*" The speaker makes the declarative statement (locutionary act) that she/he just made some coffee (Yule, 1996: 48).

According to Yule (1996: 48), the illocutionary act is carried out by the communicative force of an utterance, also known as illocutionary force. The illocutionary act becomes the central subject of Searle's framework. As cited in Mey (2001: 119-120), he established his classification of speech acts (illocutionary act) which include representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

a) Representatives

Representatives are those types of speech acts that indicate what the speaker believes to be the case or not. All the examples of the speaker describing the world as he or she thinks it is are statements of fact, assertions, conclusions, and descriptions (Yule, 1996: 53). Cutting (2002: 17) adds that certain features, such as describing, claiming, hypothesizing, insisting, and predicting, can be used to conduct these actions. For example, in the utterance "*Snakes walk on its belly*," the speaker believes that the snakes walk with its belly and not with its legs. The speaker seeks to make words blend into the environment by using a representative (of belief).

b) Directives

Directives are certain speech acts used by speakers to get something done by someone else. What the speaker requires, they express. They are commands, orders, requests, suggestions, which can be positive or negative (Yule, 1996: 54). It is the same as Cutting (2002: 17) said that these acts involve commanding, ordering, requesting, suggesting, inviting, forbidding, etc. These examples are directives, "*Could you give me your number, please?*" "*Sit down*," and "*Bring me my wallet*." In using directive, the speaker seeks to make the world suit the words (via the hearer).

c) Commissives

Commissives are speech acts used by speakers to engage in such future actions. They convey what the speaker wants (Yule, 1996: 54). Cutting (2002: 17) adds that some examples of illocutionary forces that come under the category of commissives are promising, threatening, refusing, pledging, offering, vowing, and volunteering. The following utterances illustrate the use of commissives, "*I will come back to you*," "*I'm going to go to your house tomorrow*," and "*I'll call you tonight*." The speaker uses commisives to make the world suit the words (via the speaker).

d) Expressives

Expressives are those types of speech acts that indicate what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and may be manifestations of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow (Yule, 1996: 53). In addition, Leech (1983: 56) notes that apologizing, condoling, praising, congratulating, thanking, and the like are the form of actions of illocutionary force. For example, the utterance "*Your looks are so gorgeous!*" can be regarded as the act of complimenting. In this case, a compliment is used by the speaker to express his or her appreciation and praise for the appearance of the hearer. In using an expressive, the speaker makes words that suit the world (of feeling).

e) Declarations

Declarations are those types of speech acts that transform the world by their utterance (Yule, 1996: 53). Cutting (2002: 16) stated that these acts include betting, naming, baptizing, marrying, etc. A special institutional role in a particular context is needed to carry out a declaration properly. If the speaker does not have that role, it will be infelicitous or improper for her or his utterances. Cutting (2002: 16) illustrates the example of the act of declaration: "*Now I pronounce you husband and wife*." This utterance can only be done correctly and efficiently if the priest says

it. Thus, the utterance has an impact in which two singles are turned into a married couple. The declaration can be said to alter the universe by utterances.

Perlocutionary acts, or the effects of the utterance on the hearer, are the effects of illocutionary acts (Cutting, 2002: 16). In addition, Leech states:

> "There are sixteen aspects that included as perlocutionary act such as bring hearer to learn that, persuade, deceive, encourage, irritate, frighten, amuse, get hearer to do, inspire, impress, distract, get hearer to think about, relieve tension, embarrass, attract attention, bore." (Leech, 1983: 203)

These outcomes are, of course, contingent on the specific circumstances surrounding the utterance and are rarely predictable. For instance, by saying, "*I've just made some coffee*," The speaker engages in perlocutionary acts, such as causing the hearer to account for a wonderful smell or persuading the hearer to drink some coffee (Yule, 1996: 48-49).

Speech acts would occur when people do interaction with each other. Wagner (1994: 8) stated that interaction is characterized as mutual events that involve at least two objects and two actions. Interaction happens as these objects and events impact one another generally. Therefore, communications do not only arise from one side; there must be common control by giving and receiving messages to achieve communication. According to Brown (2001), communication takes place as long as individuals connect and take action and respond to each other wherever and at any time, including in the classroom setting, whether offline or online class. Therefore, communication between students and teachers is essential to the learning process.

Communication between teacher and students can run well when the students understand the meaning of the teacher's utterances and whether the students do what the teacher wants. Hence, the teacher must ensure that the students can understand his or her utterances and are delivered correctly. The teaching and learning process involves many interactions between teachers and students, and its interactions are produced by the teacher's and students' utterances. The utterances produced in the classroom are called classroom speech acts, and it determines how teaching and learning will occur.

The classroom speech acts between teachers and students in the class are very diverse. They are starting from the beginning of learning to the end of learning. It applies to both offline and online classes. For example, in the online classroom context, when the teacher wants the students to answer his question based on the material he explained on PowerPoint, he says, "*I want you to answer this question. What is the answer?*". This utterance contains one of the directive speech acts in which the teacher instructs the students to answer the question he points in PowerPoint based on the material he previously explained. This utterance is easy for students to understand so they will answer the teacher right away. However, because it is an online class, sometimes students will not answer immediately, whether because they do not know the answer

or pay attention to what the teacher said. So, in this case, the teacher also needs to be more assertive in responding to it.

Sometimes, the students cannot understand what the teacher meant in their utterances, and they will not respond or do what the teacher wants. It happens mostly when teacher's utterances have implicit meaning. For instance, in the online classroom context, when the teacher wants the students to respond to what he asked in a video conference, but none students answer it, he says, "*I feel like talking to myself now.*" This utterance has an implicit meaning that the teacher probably irritates that none of his students answer what he asked, so he says like that and wants his students to respond immediately to avoid his irritation. This utterance is also one of directive speech acts but in implicit context. However, sometimes the students do not understand what the teacher says, so they may not respond immediately, especially in the online classroom. Sometimes, students focus on something other than their class. Therefore, the teacher needs to explain the meaning of his utterance to avoid misunderstanding.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher then got interested to analyze the speech acts used by three English teachers of SMP, SMA, and SMK during online teaching and learning process, and those three chosen teachers were from SMPIT Nurul Ikhwan Nagan Raya, SMA Tunas Luhur, and SMKN 2 Payakumbuh. Thus, this study aims to analyze the speech acts used by those three English teachers during online teaching and learning process.

METHODOLOGY

This study aimed to analyze the speech acts used by three English teachers of SMPIT Nurul Ikhwan Nagan Raya, SMA Tunas Luhur, and SMKN 2 Payakumbuh during online teaching and learning process. This research's design was descriptive-qualitative. The instrumentation used in this study were six video recordings of natural online classroom via Zoom Meeting obtained from YouTube, observation sheets, and documentation in the form of transcript of subjects' utterances. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling. The researchers chose the subjects that were the English teachers from SMPIT Nurul Ikhwah Nagan Raya, SMA Tunas Luhur, and SMKN 2 Payakumbuh. Meanwhile, the research's objects were the subjects' utterances during the online teaching and learning process in the videos. The data were the subjects' utterances obtained through observations on six online learning video recordings. The data then was transcribed into the written form or transcript, selected to fit the study's objective, recorded into the datasheets, interpreted, and analyzed using the speech acts theory. The practice of triangulation was used to check the data validity by asking the expert in this field. The researchers analyzed the data by examining all the data collected through three steps of qualitative data analysis which were data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS
Locutionary Acts

The researcher divided locutionary acts into three types based on Levinson (1983): declarative, interrogative, and imperative. The researcher found that each of them performed declarative, interrogative, and imperative forms. Here are the examples below:

a. Declarative

Teacher : *Yang pertama kali adalah ketika kita ingin melakukan perkenalan diri dengan orang lain, yang kita ucapkan adalah hi, hello, good morning, atau misalnya dengan orang tertentu misalnya dengan guru bisa pakai assalamuaikum gitu ya baru good morning atau dengan dilanjutkan dengan kalimat sapa yang lainnya.* (T1/D20)

The utterance (T1/D20) was uttered by subject A. The teacher performed it when she explained the material on the first slide of her PowerPoint about the first approach in introducing myself, such as saying hi, hello, good morning, or *assalamualaikum*. This utterance was the explanation of the material of the first approach in introducing myself that was greeting uttered by the teacher. She uttered it in declarative form.

b. Interrogative

Teacher : **Ulang-ulangi lagi, subjek plus?** (T3/D123)
Students : *Verb.*
Teacher : Ya.
Teacher : **Plus kata-kata subjunctive tadi, apa tadi namanya?** (T3/D125)
Students : *Plus 8 tadi tuh.*

Those utterances (T3/D123) and (T3/D125) were uttered by subject B. The teacher performed it when he asked students about the subjunctive formula in giving suggestions and wanted them to mention the complete formula. Those utterances were the questions the teacher asked students about the subjunctive formula in giving suggestions. He uttered it in the form of interrogative and with the question mark.

c. Imperative

Teacher : *Nah sekarang coba… nah coba perhatikan dialognya.* (T5/D106)

The utterance (T5/D106) was uttered by subject C. The teacher performed it when she commanded the students to pay attention to the dialogue on the whiteboard which needed some expressions to complete it. This utterance was the teacher's command to students to get their attention to the dialogue on the whiteboard. She uttered it in the form of imperative as a command.

The declarative locutionary act was performed mainly by the three subjects during the online teaching and learning process. Each of them employed it in almost all types and acts of illocutionary acts, but the researcher found that they mostly performed it in representative illocutionary acts. They mainly performed this declarative form to utter some explanations of the material they delivered to the students. Explaining also matched with this form since it used to tell something to the hearers, and in this case, were some explanations to be delivered to the students. Yule (1996) stated that locutionary act produced meaningful linguistic expression or called the basic of the utterance. The teachers' explanations of the materials were called the basic of the utterance since it was the literal meaning of the utterance itself.

Each subject mostly used the interrogative form in the directive illocutionary act, which was questioning. It was because questioning needed to perform in the interrogative form with a question mark. The subjects used this form to utter some questions to students during their lessons. Riemer (2010) stated that the locutionary act is the act of saying something. In addition, Yule (1996) also claimed that locutionary act produced the meaningful linguistic expression, or it is called the basic of the utterance. The questions that the teachers asked during the lesson were the act of saying something in the interrogative form and also called the basic of the utterance, which was the literal meaning as its questions.

The least was the imperative form which mainly performed in the directive illocutionary act, which was commanding. It was because commanding needed to perform in the imperative form. They used this imperative form to utter some commands to students to do something during the lesson. Same as declarative and interrogative, the teachers' commands also had the literal meaning as its commands or the basic of the utterance itself as the commands. It was also based on Yule (1996), who stated that locutionary act is the basic of utterance or produced the meaningful linguistic expression. In addition, Wardhaugh (1986) also said that it refers to the fact that we use words or sentences if we say something. In making commands, the teachers needed to use some words or sentences to make it using the imperative form, and then it was produced as the utterances itself.

Illocutionary Acts

The researcher divided illocutionary acts into five types based on Searle's theory. As cited in Mey (2001), he established his classification into representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. There were four types of illocutionary acts used: representatives, directives, commissives, and expressives, except declarations. Based on Mariani & Mu'in (2007), those are included in illocutionary acts. Here are the examples below:

a. Representatives

Teacher : ***Sorry wrong number, maaf salah sambung. Misalnya orangnya udah ngobrol kemana-mana ternyata kita nggak kenal. Sorry wrong number. I am afraid you have the wrong number. Sorry you have the wrong number.*** *Nah banyak lagi yang lainnya ya.* (T6/D25)

Teacher : ***Okay, bagaimana membuat janji lewat telpon? I'm sorry I'll be out all day, that would be fine, yes I'm sure I can make it.*** *Ini spasi nya hilang ini.* (T6/D26)

Those two utterances (T6/D25), (T6/D26) were performed by subject C. The teacher explained to students about how to say when receiving the wrong phone calls and how to make an appointment in the telephone call. Thus, these utterances were categorized as a representative illocutionary act of explaining because it was used to explain the expressions used on the telephone call.

b. Directives

Teacher : *Ibu bacakan ya. I'd like to invite you to the opening of my restaurant. Itu kata ee…Mr. Anwar. Ini dialog antara Mr. Anwar dengan Mr. Budi.*

Teacher : ***What will Mr. Budi say?*** (T5/D88)

Students : *What?*

Teacher : *Saya mau mengundangmu ke pembukaan restoran saya.* **What will Mr. Budi say?** *I'd like to invite you to the opening of my restaurant.* (T5/D89)

Students : *I'd love to but…*

The bold utterances (T5/D88) and (T5/D89) were uttered by subject C when the teacher questioned her students about the continuation of the example dialogue of invitation she showed on the whiteboard. Previously, she had already read the dialogue which contained the invitation for the receiver. She then wanted her students to continue the conversation on the dialogue by questioning them. She also repeated the dialogue and also the question once more to the students. The utterances were categorized as a directive illocutionary act of questioning because it was used to ask students about the expression used to continue the example dialogue. The use of interrogative form and question mark also indicated it.

c. Commissives

Teacher : *Nah sekarang saya ingin langsung contoh latihan ini. Saya baca dulu baru pertanyaan.* (T3/D94)

Subject B, the teacher, performed this utterance (T3/D94) when he wanted the students to get the sample exercise about the material after reading and explaining how to answer its questions to them. He wanted his students to give answers to the questions later after he explained it. The sample exercise was about completing the sentences with suitable suggestions using the subjunctives form. This utterance was categorized as a commissive illocutionary act of intending. It expressed the teacher's intention that he wanted his students to answer the questions later after he explained it first.

d. Expressives

Teacher : *Ya kita coba anu aja Faradisa mana Faradisa? Ayo mana yang ungkapan memberi saran?*

Student : *Yang I suggest, suggest you tell your parents or the local government about it.*

Teacher : **Yes, that's very good.** (T3/D36)

Subject B, the teacher, performed the utterance (T3/D36) when he gave a compliment to a student, Faradisa, who gave the correct answer to his question. Previously, he questioned Faradisa which expression of giving suggestion she could find in the dialogue shown on PowerPoint. This utterance was classified as an expressive illocutionary act of complimenting. The teacher praised Faradisa for her correct answer by complimenting her. It also could be seen as the use of "very good" in his utterance.

Subject A and subject C as the SMP and SMK teachers performed directives illocutionary acts the most during their teaching process. On the other hand, subject B as the SMA teacher performed directives the most after representatives during his teaching process. Although the results were a bit different between the three teachers, they acted using directives acts in the similar way that was when managing and controlling the lesson activities and the students during the

online teaching and learning process. Yule (1996) stated that directives are certain kinds of speech acts used by speakers to get something done by someone else. It suited Yule's statement since the researcher found the three teachers mostly used directives in questioning/asking and commanding acts to the students during the lesson. These acts were used by the teachers to make students do something which was answering their questions and doing their commands. Questioning/asking was used to make students more active in the class and check their knowledge or comprehension of the lesson's material. Moreover, commanding was used by the teachers when they wanted their students to do something during the lesson, and then they gave a command to them.

The researcher found that subject B as the SMA teacher performed representatives acts the most during his teaching process. On the other hand, subject A and subject C as the SMP and SMK teachers performed representatives the most after directives in their teachings. According to Yule (1996), representatives are those types of speech acts that indicate what the speaker believes to be the case or not. All the examples of the speaker describing the world as he or she thinks it is are statements of fact, assertions, conclusions, and descriptions. Although the three subjects had a little bit different in results, they also acted in similar acts in representatives which suited with Yule's statement. The researcher found they mostly used representatives in performing the act of explaining the materials and informing some information related to the lesson to the students during teaching and learning process. By explaining, it made the teachers were easier to transfer the materials to the students. The teachers needed to explain the materials so that the students would understand. Moreover, the aim of informing is to tell the students about certain facts that they do not know.

For the expressives illocutionary act, the researcher found that the three subjects performed it too during their teaching process. Expressives are those types of speech acts that indicate what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and may be manifestations of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow (Yule, 1996). The researcher found that each subject mostly used expressive in the same act which was when complimenting students, and it suited what Yule stated. Complimenting was used when the teachers expressed their admiration or approval about the achievement or the characteristics of students in doing something during the lesson.

Each subject also performed commissive illocutionary acts during their teachings. Commissives are types of speech acts used by speakers to engage in such future actions. They convey what the speaker wants (Yule, 1996). The three teachers mainly used the same act the most that was intending act. This act engaged students in future action suited to what Yule stated before. Intending was an act used by the teachers to express what they wanted to do in the near future during the teaching and learning process.

Perlocutionary Acts

The researcher divided perlocutionary acts based on Leech's classification of perlocutionary acts (Leech, 1983). The researcher found that the subjects did ten types of perlocutionary acts that affected the hearer(s)/the student(s) from their illocutionary acts: hearer(s):

attracted, learn something, do something, think something, impressed, persuaded, embarrassed, amused, inspired, and frightened. Here are the examples below:

a. Hearer(s): Attracted

Teacher : *Next, berikut siapa lagi yang bisa membuat sebuah undangan?*
Students : *Alvin Alvin.*
Teacher : *Coba Alvin.*
Teacher : ***Coba Husnul.*** (T5/D152)
Student : ***Iya bu.***
Teacher : *Coba.*
Student : ***Do you want to come to my house tomorrow?***

Subject C, the teacher, uttered the utterance (T5/D152) when she called a student named Husnul to make an invitation. She called him since previous student who she called did not respond. The teacher called his name to make him attracted to her and to know that he was asked to make an invitation. Her call succeeded attract him since the student answered her call as his response then made the invitation as he told.

b. Hearer(s): Learn Something

Teacher : *Okay, contohnya ini. Hello! This is Anne speaking. Atau boleh juga menyapa good morning! Atau… kalau bentuknya ini mungkin dalam situasi formal. Directory assistant can I help you? Kalau misalnya kalian sudah di lokasi kerja. Ini adalah asisten director, ada yang bisa saya bantu? Nah okay, ini adalah cara menerima telpon.* (T6/D21)

Teacher : *Nah bagaimana cara menanyakan siapa yang menelpon? Ini ada banyak ya caranya. Dan contohnya ada disini adalah who is it please? Ini siapa? Who is it calling, please? Siapa yang menelpon? Itu kalau kita tidak tau siapa yang menelpon. Biasanya ini untuk situasi formal, may I ask who is calling?* (T6/D22)

The utterances (T6/D21) and (T6/D22) were performed by subject C. The teacher explained to students about how to say first when answering a telephone call and how to asking who is calling in a telephone call. She also provided it with some example expressions that also showed on her PowerPoint, and she also translated it into Bahasa Indonesia so that the students would know its meaning. She explained it to make her students learn about the expressions and its examples used when answering a telephone call and how to asking who is calling in a telephone call, so they would understand it. Their response was also good since they paid attention to her explanation. Thus, they could get the knowledge from the teacher.

c. Hearer(s): Do Something

Teacher : *Ya baik anak-anak sekalian. Nah coba Farhan dibaca 8 kata subjunctive ini.* (T3/D91)
Student : *Suggest, advise, insist, demand, recommend, propose, request, sama ask apaan sir?*

Subject B, the teacher, performed this utterance (T3/D91) when he commanded a student named Farhan to read eight subjunctive words of subjunctive form on the slide on PowerPoint shown. In this case, the perlocutionary act met the teacher's expectation in which Farhan did what he commanded by reading the eight subjunctive words as his response to the teacher's command.

d. Hearer(s): Think Something

Teacher : *Nah, ini dialog antara Dona dengan ee…Susan misalnya.* ***Kira-kira Susan bilang apa?***
*****What will Susan say?*** Would you like to come over for dinner tonight? Kata Dona.* ***Susan***
*****bilang apa?*** (T5/D70)

Students : ***Ee…***

Teacher : ***Yes…?*** (T5/D71)

Students : ***Yes…***

Teacher : *Yes…?*

Students : *Yes, I'd like to.*

Subject C, the teacher, performed the utterance (T5/D70) when she questioned the students about the proper continuation for the example dialogue that she showed on the whiteboard. They needed to give an expression as the answer in receiving the invitation based on the dialogue. The students did not answer directly since they were thinking for the answer first to be a proper answer for the invitation to the dialogue. It could be seen from the students' responses for the utterances (T5/D70) and (T5/D71), and also their expressions in thinking it. After they got the proper answer, they uttered it to the teacher.

e. Hearer(s): Impressed

Teacher : *Ya kita coba anu aja Faradisa mana Faradisa? Ayo mana yang ungkapan memberi*
*****saran?*

Student : *Yang I suggest, suggest you tell your parents or the local government about it.*

Teacher : ***Yes, that's very good.*** (T3/D36)

This utterance (T3/D36) was uttered by subject B when the teacher gave a compliment to a student named Faradisa, who gave the correct answer to his question. Previously, the teacher questioned Faradisa which expression of giving suggestion she could find on the example dialogue shown on the PowerPoint. He uttered it to praise her for the correct answer she gave. As the response, Faradisa then felt impressed that her teacher praised her for her answer, which meant that her answer was correct. It was indicated by her expression who felt impressed then she laughed happily at his praise.

f. Hearer(s): Persuaded

Teacher : *Yang kedua tell your name.*

Teacher : ***Apa artinya? Ada yang tau artinya apa itu tell your name?*** (T1/D25)

Students : *Siapa nama kamu.*

Subject A, the teacher, uttered this utterance (T1/D25) when she invited students to answer the meaning of "tell your name" in Bahasa Indonesia as the second approach in introducing myself that she would explain. She used an interrogative form to invite them and used gentle words to persuade them to answer. As for the response, the teacher then succeeded in making the students persuaded by trying to give the correct answer to the teacher. It could be seen in their response in the utterance.

g. Hearer(s): Embarrassed

Teacher : *Would you like to…? Maukah kamu datang ke pesta saya? What do you say?*

Teacher : ***Coba Randy.*** (T5/D133)

Students : *Nggak ngerti bu hihihi.*
Teacher : **Nggak ngertinya dimana?** (T5/D134)
Student : *Nggak ngerti hihihi.*

      Subject C, the teacher, performed the utterance (T5/D133) when she commanded a student named Randy to make an invitation using the expression she told in English before. Unfortunately, Randy did not understand the material that the teacher explained before, so he responded that he did not understand it while laughing shyly and made an expression of an embarrassed person. The teacher then asked what topic that he did not understand it (T5/D134), but he still said he did not understand and laughed shyly to her. These responses showed that Randy was embarrassed to reveal that he did not understand the material to his teacher, so he could not do what the teacher commanded him.

h. Hearer(s): Amused

Teacher : *Ayo lagi nih masih banyak nih, mrs. Anita insists that he… apa ayo?*
Teacher : **Dijawab oleh Siti Lutfiatul. Nah ini Siti Lutfi nih. Ini adalah si jutek dari 11 IPS tapi kalau di kamera nggak terlalu sadis wajahnya lebih ramah hahaha…** (T3/D114)
Student : *Hahaha…*

      The utterance (T3/D114) was uttered by the teacher when he made a joke about Siti Lutfiatul. He uttered this joke after he called her to give the suggestion for the sentence on the PowerPoint. As for the response, Siti Lutfiatul was amused by his joke. It could be indicated by her laughing at the teacher's joke.

i. Hearer(s): Inspired

Teacher : *Saya…sudah mencarimu. It's my brother's birthday today. Ada ulang tahun saudara laki-laki saya hari ini. We're holding a garden party this afternoon. Sore ini kita mengadakan pesta kebun. I'd like to invite you to the party. Saya mau mengundangmu ke pesta. Adam bilang apa? What will Adam say?*
…
Teacher : *Bagaimana caranya Adam menerima? What will Adam say? I…?*
Teacher : **Ambil aja salah satu dari poin menerima undangan tadi.** (T5/D54)
Students : *I'd love to.*

      The utterance (T5/D54) was performed by subject C. Previously, the teacher questioned the students about the correct expression used to complete the example dialogue that she showed on PowerPoint. The teacher then suggested they pick an expression of accepting an invitation from her explanation before to complete the dialogue. As for the response, the students then were inspired by the teacher's suggestion as the idea to complete the dialogue. Then, they gave an expression of accepting the invitation as the answer to complete the example dialogue. It showed on their utterance above.

j. Hearer(s): Frightened

Teacher : *Tapi kenapa semuanya dipanggil miss di dalam grup? Bu Dewi dipanggil miss, Bu Santi dipanggil miss, semua dipanggil miss. Ya, miss itu khusus guru Bahasa Inggris sudah miss bilang.* (T1/D151)

Students : *Nggak tau.*
Students : *Nggak tau nomornya.*

The teacher was angry that her students still called all the female teachers "miss" in their group chat and not only to the English teacher, even though she already told them (T1/D151). As for the response, the students felt frightened that their teacher was angry to them. They fell silent for a moment when listening to their teacher. Then they tried to defend themselves by giving the reasons why they called "miss" to all the female teachers in the group.

Perlocutionary acts produced by the subjects also sometimes did not match the subjects' expectations from their illocutionary acts. It could be led to different perlocutionary acts from the expectations or did not utterly succeed. It is in line with Bach & Harnis (1979) who said "the success of the perlocutionary act depends on hearer's identifying one of the other acts." Moreover, the most performed perlocutionary acts by the three subjects were perlocutionary acts which took effect hearer(s): learn something and hearer(s): do something.

Perlocutionary act hearer(s): learn something occurred because previously the teachers did some illocutionary acts first. The researcher found that they mostly performed the same illocutionary act: representatives, mostly the act of explaining and informing. Explaining was an act performed by the teachers in which to explain some materials to students and bring them to learn and understand it. From the teachers' explanation, the students then would understand it and got the knowledge of it. It happened since their response was good in which they paid attention to their explanation. It also applied for informing act in which used to tell some information related to their lesson and bring the students to know and understand about it.

For perlocutionary act hearer(s): do something, it occurred when the teachers performed some illocutionary acts. The most performed was directives: questioning and commanding acts. In questioning the students, the teachers wanted them to do as the teachers wished which was answering the question as to their response. When the students answered, then it would meet the teachers' expectations to them which led to the success of the perlocutionary act. Moreover, commanding was also an act in which the teachers used to bring the students to do something during the lesson according to their commands. If the students' response was doing what the teachers wanted, then the perlocutionary act succeeded. However, sometimes the students also did not give the response to the teachers by giving answers for teachers' questions or did as being commanded, hence, in these cases perlocutionary act did not succeed from the teachers' expectation.

Furthermore, the speech acts produced by the three teachers, the researcher found that they did it naturally when teaching and also if there were unforeseen circumstances, they would perform speech acts although they never had the idea to say it before. This is natural because speech acts always occur when someone says something in certain conditions with some intentions behind it. It is in line with Derin, Deliani, Fauziah, Afifah, & Hamuddin (2019 in Gowasa, Radiana, & Afifah, 2019) who stated that "speech act is a product of speech in certain conditions and the smallest of communication languages that determine the meaning of a sentence."

The researcher also found that the three teachers in doing their speech acts during teaching the students had different ways in expressing it. This could be shown on the way how each teacher spoke, their accents, and the way of its delivery. It was because of difference culture between the three subjects in which subject A is from Aceh, subject B is from East Java, and subject C is from West Sumatra. Archer, Aijmer, & Wichmann (2012) said "studies have also demonstrated that our linguistic behavior is motivated and shaped by cultural beliefs, values, and attitudes". It could be seen from Archer et al.'s statement that the three teachers with different background would have different ways in expressing their speech acts to their students when teaching in the classroom.

Moreover, it could be connected to the theory of integrated language teaching in which integrating the four skills. In teaching English, the teachers cannot be separated from teaching the four skills, namely listening, reading, speaking, and writing which are integrated and cannot be separated. It is in line with Hersan (1998 in Pardede, 2019) who pointed out that in daily life the four language skills "are seen in integration … So, in the classroom, the activities should be taught in integration in order to arrive at ease in communication".

From the results, the researcher found that the teachers' teaching was still not following the integrated teaching theory which combines the four language skills. The thing that lacking was the way they interacted with their students from the use of speech acts during teaching which was still dominated by the use of Bahasa Indonesia compared to English. For example, when the teachers questioned students to check their understanding, they used Bahasa Indonesia to question them. In this case, the teachers did not train students in their listening skill in understanding the teachers' question and only focused on checking their understanding of the material so that their listening skill was not trained properly. Moreover, the response of the students to questions posed by the teachers also depended on the content of the questions whether it needed to be answered in English or Bahasa Indonesia. It could also affect the students' speaking skills when teachers needed responses or answers from them in Bahasa Indonesia which would not practice their speaking skills in English pronunciation.

It could be seen that Bahasa Indonesia was used as the main language of instruction by the subjects. It was seen by the functions of speech acts uttered by them. However, the use of Bahasa Indonesia frequently than English as the medium of instruction is not appropriate since the subject is English, not Bahasa Indonesia. This can cause inhibit the process of acquiring English for the students. According to Haryanto, Sulistiyo, Khairani, & Wulan (2016), the students who are only taught in Bahasa (L1) have no ability to use English and have no possibility of mastering it. It can be inferred that the use of Bahasa Indonesia in English classrooms can serve to improve the efficiency of teaching and learning processes, as long as it is not overused and does not become a habit in the classroom. Johnson (1997 in Ibrahim, 2001) also argues "mixing and switching are counterproductive because they are self-perpetuating substitutes for L2 acquisition". Maintaining

this technique, he believes, will raise the question of whether L1 development is supposed to assist or replace L2 development.

CONCLUSION

In term of locutionary acts, each subject mostly performed the declarative form and mainly in representative used to utter some explanations of the materials. For illocutionary acts, each subject mostly performed directives (questioning act which used to allow the students to be active and check their comprehension); representatives (explaining the materials and informing some information related to the lesson). And for perlocutionary acts, perlocutionary act student(s): learn something and do something was primarily occurred. Student(s): learn something mainly occurred when performed explaining and informing representative acts resulted to students knew/understood the explanations and information. Perlocutionary act student(s): do something mainly occurred when questioning and commanding directive acts resulted in students giving the answers and doing as commanded. Moreover, the subjects' ways in expressing their speech acts were quite different since having different background and culture. This could be shown on the way how each teacher spoke, their accents, and the way of its delivery. The subjects also still used Bahasa Indonesia dominantly rather than English in their speech acts which was not following the integrated approach in language teaching.

REFERENCES

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mu'in, F., Dini, N. A., & Rosyi, A. (2018). *Language in Oral Production Perspectives*. Banjarmasin: CV. Rasi Terbit.

Mariani, N. & Fatchul, M. (2007). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Banjarmasin: Jurusan PBS FKIP Universitas Lambung Mangkurat.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction (2nd ed)*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language (4th ed)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bach, K. & Robert, M. H., (1979). *Linguistics Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Archer, D., Aijmer, K., & Wichmann, A. (2012). *Pragmatics: An Advanced Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Richards, J. C. & Richard, S. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd ed)*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. United Kingdom: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Pardede, P. (2019). Integrated Skills Approach in EFL Classrooms: A Literature Review. In Parlindungan P. (Ed.), *EFL Theory and Practice: Voice of EED UKI: Proceeding English*

Education Department Collegiate Forum (EED CF) 2015-2018 (pp. 147-159). Jakarta: UKI Press.

Wagner, E. D. (1994). In Support of A Functional Definition of Interaction. *American Journal of Distance Education, 8(2),* 6-29.

Gowasa, N., S., Sonia, P. R., & Nur, A. (2019). A Study on the Use of Speech Acts: A Review of Selected Paper. *ELSYA: Journal of English Language Studies*, 1(2), 55-60.

Haryanto, E., Urip, S., Miftahul, K., & Retno, W. (2016). Indonesian or English? EFL Student Teachers' Preference and Perception on the Language Use in the Classroom. *IJEE* (*Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 3(1), 46-59. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v3i1.3941

Ibrahim, J. (2001). The Implementation of EMI (English Medium Instruction) in Indonesian Universities: Its Opportunities, Its Threats, Its Problems, and Its Possible Solutions. *KITA,* 3(2), 121-138.